

## Original Comments

## Comments

Total Comments: 766 (Between ID: 12 and 824)

Online: 262

Email: 17

Form: 68

Written: 180

Transcript: 213

Categorized  
Comments by  
SubtopicCommon Concern  
Statements

&gt;Home

	ID	Commentor	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Method
Categorized Comment	745	Abernathy, Kent	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>If No Mass Transit - Then No Action. Tell CDOT to Take There Archaic Short-Sighted Plan and Put it Somewhere Else.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	295	Abrahamson, Craig	Public	2/9/2005	<p>My name is Craig Abrahamson. I'm the director of the Clear Creek County Emergency Medical Services. I'm a certified paramedic by the state of Colorado and a registered professional engineer. I have several hats. I also happen to be a fourth-generation Georgetown native. My kids are fifth-generation.</p> <p>I've lived through the initial I-70 construction. My grandfather and father were actually involved with Peter Kiewit and Sons. I've seen firsthand the benefit and the detriment that it represents to this community for the last 35 years. The following comments, which are my own, go specifically to safety and processes.</p> <p>As to safety, I must say that I agree with the areas of concern -- safety concern in Clear Creek County that are identified in the draft. I take issue, however, with how those proposed actions to address the specific safety deficiencies are incorporated into the various alternatives. Further, I found the draft is lacking in the integration of safety performance factors in the identification of the preferred grouping.</p> <p>None of the transit-built alternatives except six-lane with AGS, includes the whole set of safety improvements provided for in the minimal action or other highway alternatives. Specifically, all but one of the auxiliary lanes proposed under minimal action is excluded. This directly affects the result of the safety performance of these alternatives in the analysis. All safety improvements proposed under the minimal action should be included in the transit-built alternatives.</p> <p>Of the five highway criteria used to compare the existing draft -- need, environmental sensitivity, community values, and, quote, ability to implement, also known as cost -- only two were used to objectively group the alternatives: Need and cost. Specific performance thresholds are established for these two components, while no specific performance requirement is established for safety. Why is that?</p> <p>The six-lane highway with AGS, and AGS alone -- the two safest alternatives considering injury and fatality and total accident rates are not even in the preferred grouping as a result of CDOT's insistence that cost be considered first and above all other criteria and because no objective comparison or grouping of alternatives based on safety was undertaken. As it turns out, six lanes with AGS is not only the safest alternative, but it also best meets the need in terms of satisfying travel demand.</p> <p>Further bias in favor of cost over safety exists in the selection of bus in guideway-related alternatives as the only transit-built alternatives that made it to the preferred grouping. Evaluation of all the safety data for bus systems, which is tucked away in Appendix B, indicates that the alternatives that include built bus and guideway components perform worse than any other alternative in terms of safety.</p> <p>An incomplete subjective analysis of the essential project needs and purposes not only does a disservice to the communities affected by I-70 capacity improvements but to those improvements they are intended to serve. Cost is a relatively arbitrary criteria compared with the safety of the public, environmental sensitivity, and community values. Please, clearly identify those alternatives that best address safety, environmental sensitivity, and community values first; then let the people responsible for funding the project, us, the tax payers, tell you whether or not it is reasonable.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	656	Historic Georgetown	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/10/2005	<p>Historic Georgetown, Inc. Post Office Box 667 Georgetown, Colorado 80444-0667 (303) 569-2840 Metro (303) 674-2625</p> <p>May 10, 2005</p> <p>David Nicol, Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Ave. Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Dear Mr. Nicol,</p> <p>Historic Georgetown Inc. (HGI) is a consulting party to the Section 106 review which is underway for the I70 Mountain Corridor. As a consulting party within the Georgetown Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District, HGI will direct comments to the Landmark District specifically.</p> <p>Special protection of Landmark Districts is the subject of Section 110 of the National Preservation Act. The draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the I70 Mountain Corridor acknowledges Section 110 in a statement on page 3.15-1 which reads "Section 110 of the NHPA protects NHLs." That statement appears to be the total discussion and consideration of Section 110's requirement of a higher standard of consideration for Landmark Districts.</p> <p>The Landmark District is acknowledged in the Revised Reconnaissance study, page 4-61, in which it is indicated that the District is listed as a Landmark under all four criteria of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The Reconnaissance study (4.5.3.1) on page 4-61 fails to accurately describe the extent and intent of the District. The physical setting of the District, with the remnants of its mining heritage in the surrounding mountains, is considered a key element of District designation. Any disturbance of that setting becomes a physical taking of the District.</p> <p>The Reconnaissance study mentions a few of the potentially 400 plus structures and sites within the District that may be individually eligible as NRHP sites. A number of these were listed as "field ineligible" at a time when it was not the National Register policy to consider individual sites within a Landmark District. That policy has since changed. All structures and sites within the District will require reevaluation.</p> <p>The effect of the initial construction of the interstate on this Landmark District was devastating. Most of Georgetown was physically preserved and the Loop valley left with just enough space to reconstruct the Loop Railroad. However, Silver Plume, a necessary part of the District story as the home of the miners and mining, was decimated. The entire District was left in a high noise area with visual pollution of unlandscaped cuts, overshadowing bridges and a deadly geologic hazard. The current PEIS states "there will be additional cumulative effects." When is "a little more" too much? The goal should be to redress rather than expand the misuse of the Landmark.</p> <p>The Landmark District has not been identified in the mitigation sections of the PEIS as a uniquely sensitive area. The commitment to follow a Section 106 Programmatic agreement in the face of policies to only vary standard design in "isolated instances" (PEIS 3.19.2 IB) does not avoid or minimize harm to this District.</p> <p>Further Section 3.19 in the PEIS indicates detailed planning is already complete for Georgetown and Silver Plume. Tunnels are eliminated, horizontal and vertical realignments that could mitigate noise are stated to be too expensive. Yet a mitigation policy exists to "encourage interested parties to develop and evaluate a list reasonable design refinements to the selected alternative that would represent an affected community's ideal of aesthetically pleasing infrastructure." (3.19.2 IE). Unfortunately, the PEIS preferred alternatives are based entirely, and inappropriately, on cost estimates of the least expensive construction. Doing some highway sections well, rather than all of them poorly, does not seem to be an option.</p> <p>Historic Georgetown acknowledges the traffic and congestion needs within the District. We believe that</p>	Written

the resolution of that problem provides a unique opportunity, through creative design, to improve safety in an identified high hazard area, and to relieve the brutal noise and visual impacts of the current interstate on the Landmark District. An outstanding, context sensitive, 21st century design would be a compliment to the District's 19th century engineering marvel the Georgetown Loop. It will not be inexpensive to "do it right." In the long run, however, it would indicate our respect for the energy and imagination of our forebearers and leave a proud legacy for the future.

In keeping with Section 110, Historic Georgetown Inc. would be pleased to participate in an open discussion of multiple design options for the Landmark District. In that effort, please describe both the process and results of the Section 110 consultation. Additionally, is there a Section 110 agreement that details the efforts to avoid and minimize harm within the Landmark? We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Dana Abrahamson  
Executive Director

cc: U.S. Senator Wayne Allard  
U.S. Senator Ken Salazar  
U.S. Representative Mark Udall  
Colorado Senate President Joan Fitz -Gerald  
Colorado Representative Tom Plant  
Georgianna Contiguglia, State Historic Preservation Officer  
Dan Corson, Amy Pallante, State Office of Historic Preservation  
Carol Legard, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation  
Ann Pritzlaff, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation  
Lysa Wegman-French, National Park Service  
James Lindberg, National Trust for Historic Preservation  
Cecelia Joy, COOT, Project Manager  
Mary Ann Naber, FHWA, Federal Preservation Office

Categorized Comment	632	Loveland Ski Areas	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	May 24, 2005	Email
	<p>Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Dear Jean</p> <p>Loveland concurs in and supports the alternative identified by our trade association, Colorado Ski Country USA and the comment Colorado Ski Country has filed on the I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mark Abrahamson Loveland Ski Areas</p>					

Categorized Comment	697	Clear Creek County Emergency Medical Services	Counties	5/23/2005	Clear Creek County Emergency Medical Services Clear Creek Ambulance P. O. Box 2000 Georgetown, Colorado 80444	Written
	<p>May 23, 2005</p> <p>Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011</p> <p>Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineers Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy and Ms. Wallace:</p> <p>This letter documents my analysis of the safety issues related to the alternatives presented in the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Draft PEIS). Please accept this as formal commentary on behalf of Clear Creek County.</p> <p>The following sections include information drawn directly from the Draft PEIS, information gathered from other sources as a check against information presented in the Draft PEIS, and commentary on specific points of concern. All sources of information include citations and page/section references. A number of data points presented in the Draft PEIS are reformatted and consolidated to facilitate analysis of the information provided. Commentary is identified as such, and every effort has been made for format such commentary to be consistent with Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines.</p> <p>SAFETY</p> <p>Areas of Safety Concern</p> <p>The Draft PEIS identified the following locations of safety concern in Clear Creek County (page ES-22):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Portion of I-70 between Loveland Pass (mp 216) and Bakerville (mp 221);</li> <li>· Georgetown Hill (also referred to as the Georgetown incline) (mp 226 – mp 228);</li> <li>· Empire Junction (mp 232) to Downieville (mp 234);</li> <li>· Fall River Curves (mp 237 – mp 238);</li> <li>· Twin Tunnels (mp 242) to Floyd Hill Exit (mp 247)</li> </ul> <p>Locations of safety concern are identified using a Weighted Hazard Index (WHI), which is described on page 1-17. Areas with accident rates (normalized by million vehicle miles of travel) above the state-wide average are identified as Areas of Safety Concern. Descriptions of the specific safety issues in each segment are provided in Section 1.7.4.</p> <p>I concur with the areas of safety concern in Clear Creek County identified in the PEIS. I would note, however, that although reference is made to Loveland Pass as a hazardous materials route (page 1-3), the numerous significant hazardous materials spills that occur on both sides of the Pass are not mentioned as environmental or safety concerns. I understand that Loveland Pass is not on the I-70 mainline, it is however a significant part of the I-70 transportation network and should be included in the analysis as a safety environmental issue.</p> <p>"Grouping" of Alternatives</p> <p>Four Project Purposes are stated in the Draft PEIS (page 1-2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Environmental Sensitivity</li> <li>· Respect for Community Values</li> <li>· Safety</li> <li>· Ability to Implement</li> </ul> <p>The Draft PEIS does not indicate anywhere that any one stated purpose is weighted differently from any other. However, "Ability to Implement", a.k.a. Cost, was used as the sole criteria for identifying "preferred" and "other" alternatives (page 2-128). All alternatives with an associated cost of greater than \$4B were removed from the "preferred" grouping. Safety, environmental sensitivity, and respect for community values are not even mentioned as being considered in the grouping process, except to say that alternatives meet these other purposes "to varying degrees".</p> <p>Safety of Alternatives</p> <p>The Draft PEIS rates the safety of various alternatives in three ways: Total Accidents, Injury Accidents, and Fatal Accidents. Table 2-22 on page 2-111 summarizes the estimated accident rates for each alternative – sort of.</p> <p>Accident Reduction Factors – A basic premise of the safety analysis of alternatives is the concept of Accident Reduction Factors (page 2-109). These are numerical factors associated with various types of improvements, developed by the Colorado Department of Transportation, that are applied to baseline accident rates to calculate a revised accident rate for the improved highway. There is no way to verify the validity of the specific Accident Reduction Factors used in the Draft PEIS, as they are not provided.</p> <p>Calculation of Accident Rates – Section 2.3.6 documents the Safety Comparison of Alternatives (pages 2-109 through 2-111). In the discussion, only fatality rates are used to compare alternatives — total accidents and injury accidents are not used.</p> <p>Section 2.3.6.3 includes a lengthy discussion of the high accident and injury rates predicted for bus</p>					

systems. The Draft PEIS excludes the total accident and injury accident rates for bus systems from Volume I completely (see Table 2-22), but does include them in Table B-11 in Volume II, "for full disclosure". The justification for exclusion of the accident and injury rates for bus systems in the text on page 2-109 is:

"Because bus accident and injury data calculated from the 2001 NTD (National Transit Database) are not directly comparable to other modes, these rates are not shown in Table 2-22."

However, the extensive discussion of the bus accident reporting requirements leading up to this conclusion is misleading. The text includes a discussion of how accident reporting requirements for bus systems changed between 2001 and 2002, which is completely irrelevant because the text also points out that only 2001 data from the National Transit Database is used in the analysis (in other words, no comparison is made between accident rates in 2001 vs. 2002 in the Draft PEIS). Furthermore, the discussion implies that the reporting requirements for motor vehicles differ from those for bus systems (paragraphs 2 and 3 in Section 2.3.6.3) and, therefore, bus system accident rates cannot be compared with accident rates for any other mode or alternative. The Draft PEIS states that the accident reporting requirements for bus systems in 2001 (the year from which the transit accident data is drawn) qualified an injury accident as follows:

"Any physical damage or harm to a person requiring medical treatment, or any physical damage or harm to a person reported at the time and place of occurrence."

The Colorado State Patrol classifies injury accidents as follows:

Any accident in which there are "possible" injuries, "evident non-incapacitating" injuries, or "evident incapacitating" injuries is classified as an injury accident. (Telephone conversation with Technician Doug Barnes, Colorado State Patrol on January 13, 2005).

In other words, any obvious injury or claim of injury at the scene qualifies that accident as an injury crash.

A reasonable person can see that these definitions are the essentially the same. It follows then that the justification for excluding any 2001 bus system accident statistics from the analysis and comparison of alternatives is invalid and consequently, any conclusions drawn from an evaluation of the accident data on the whole are invalid.

**Geologic Hazards Related to Safety** - The presence of significant rockfall hazard (rated "severe") at the "Georgetown Incline" or "Georgetown Hill" (mp 226 - mp 228) is discussed at great length in Section 3.7. The discussion quite correctly indicates that the hazard results from natural conditions and as a result of the methods used during original construction. In several locations in the report the Georgetown Incline is described as being the most active rockfall area on the corridor, and the hillsides "along the section to be widened in Clear Creek are some of the most active rockfall sites in the State." (page 3.7-11)

With regard to the Georgetown Incline, the report points out that there have been approximately 100 accidents in this stretch caused by rockfall since 1995, seven of which have resulted in fatalities (page 3.7-7). It is quite clear on the point that rockfall mitigation is required.

Unfortunately, despite a clear position that extensive rockfall mitigation is required, the Draft PEIS provides almost no discussion of the alternatives for this mitigation. The report simply jumps to the following conclusion:

"After consideration of numerous mitigation designs at the Georgetown Incline, CDOT has determined that fencing is the most practicable technique for the protection of the traveling public." (page 3.7-12)

This despite the fact that only last Spring the newly placed fencing at the Georgetown Incline near the Scenic Overlook was obliterated by a massive rockfall that mangled three tractor-trailers. The event covered all four lanes of highway with rocks the size of small automobiles. Fortunately, the event occurred at approximately 2:00 in the morning, so traffic was extremely light. Had that event occurred 6 or 7 hours later, the number of fatalities would have been staggering. The fencing has yet to be replaced.

CDOT and FHWA are obliged to consider extensive rockfall hazard mitigation alternatives at the Georgetown Incline. This should include a complete disclosure of all available alternatives, and a thorough screening process to identify those most effective.

**Specific Safety Improvement Measures** — The following matrix illustrates the specific highway safety improvements to be implemented in Clear Creek County as part of each alternative. It is essentially a summation/simplification of Table 2-4 on page 2-23 of the Draft PEIS.

The shaded cells indicate that the safety measure listed on the left has not been included for consideration in the corresponding alternative along the bottom. Empty cells indicate that the measure has been included in the respective alternative. The matrix reveals several interesting points:

- The steep grade on the west side of Floyd Hill (mp 244 to mp 247) is a safety concern identified in the Draft PEIS (WHI = 0.16). No mitigation measure for this problem is identified.

- Each of the alternatives that include highway build components also includes mitigation of all areas of safety concern except the Floyd Hill grade issue.

- Mitigation in areas of safety concern is omitted from each and every transit alternative that does not include a specific highway build component. Specifically, each of these "transit only" alternatives excludes all safety related auxiliary lane construction in Clear Creek County except the eastbound auxiliary lane from mp 216 to Herman Gulch.

Safety Deficiency Matrix located here

CDOT and FHWA have ignored a key safety concern in the Floyd Hill area. At a minimum there should be consideration given to curve smoothing and a runaway truck ramp to mitigate the effects of the steep grade.

Exclusion of key safety elements from the transit build alternatives shown in the matrix above influences the outcome of the safety analysis in the Draft PEIS. Since these safety measures were excluded, the corresponding accident reduction factors were not applied. If the accident reduction factors for these measures had been applied, the resulting projected accident rates for the relevant alternatives would be lower. The end result is that these transit build alternatives would have had an even better anticipated safety outcome in the analysis. CDOT and FHWA should include mitigation measures Floyd Hill in the analysis. Further, the all of the transit build alternatives should include all identified highway safety measures identified for the highway build alternatives.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this significant project.

Sincerely,

Craig E. Abrahamson, MSCE, PE, EMT-P  
Director, Clear Creek County Emergency Medical Services

Cc: Clear Creek Board of County Commissioners  
Technical Sufficiency Committee  
Holland Smith

Categorized Comment	ID	Author	Category	Date	Text	Type
Categorized Comment	771	Alderman, Susan	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  The problem exists only on weekends six months out of the year... we need to look at immediate solutions first - i.e., what to do about trucks and their travel time, real consequences to violating chain laws, exploring bus travel that's dependable and frequent, and manipulating lanes based on traffic needs. Susan Alderman, spalderman@earthlink.net, 0334 F Road, Silverthorne, CO 80498.	Written
Categorized Comment	184	Aldridge, Joe	Public	2/14/2005	I am in favor a High Speed Elevated Transit as the best solution for this Corridor, and it should be constructed instead of more highway lanes or a bus guideway.  The funding for this and other large projects, and the maintenance of all roadways should be funded by the State gasoline tax. If there is not enough cash in the fund then the tax should be raised.	Online
Categorized Comment	243	Allison, Kevin	Public	2/28/2005	putting 6 lanes down the I70 mtn. corridor is crazy and stupid! there will always be to much traffic down that highway no matter what you do. the quality of life in summit county is being lowered dramatically due to the greed of the ski resorts for more revenue from the way to cheap ski passes... they want to make money by massive amounts of volume and are recking the quality of life. Let the I70 mtn. corridor get busy and many will get tired of it and stop coming, which would be a blessing. I have lived in Breckenridge for 36 years and have seen it getting way to busy.... leaving the highway as is would be a fantastic traffic deterrent! Do not give into all the greed for money up here by giving into the money thirsty ski industry and there associates..... they	Online

just kill the area and take all their money and leave.... do not kid yourself...  
they don't stay here and live in the mess they created.  
I urge you not to increase the lanes of the I70 mt. corridor.  
Kevin Allison

Categorized Comment	281	Aloia, Sonnie	Public	3/8/2005	Repairs and upgrades are long over due. I am interested to know when discussions about the foundations and soil retention systems will be taking place.  Respectfully, Sonnie Aloia	Online
Categorized Comment	721	Anderson, Elizabeth	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  No response.	Written
Categorized Comment	527	Anderson, Henry K.	Public	5/20/2005	We must address the modern mass transit issue NOW. A high speed elevated system must be placed into the immediate plans, not later. If the budget is not enough, then why can't you ask President Bush for more money since he can get 85 Billion for another country?	Online
Categorized Comment	528	Anderson, Henry K.	Public	5/20/2005	Chapter 3.19 Mitigation: States in one sentence that "standard design" will be used and then states in next line "context sensitive design will be used". Why is this? We need to have sensitive design used at all times and try to build beautiful highway. Why do you have both of these stated?	Online
Categorized Comment	529	Anderson, Henry K.	Public	5/20/2005	Chapter 3.19 also says communities will be involved in planning and then says detailed planning is complete in Georgetown/Silver Plume and Idaho Springs. These communities are not happy with the designs and were not involved in the current plans. How is it that Georgetown and Silver Plume were not involved in the planning?	Online
Categorized Comment	530	Anderson, Henry K.	Public	5/20/2005	I believe that you need to address the pinch points in Clear Creek County, add in a rapid transit that is not buses in guideways. Pinch points should be done in the priority of worst done first: i.e., Twin Tunnels to Floyd Hill, Eisenhower Tunnel with an additional bore for transit and automobiles, US40 Junction and Georgetown hill being the obvious places and priority. Why haven't you addressed the project in this manner?	Online
Categorized Comment	83	Anderson, Henry K.	Public	1/24/2005	From: Henry K Anderson Jr Email: mailto:smoky@smokyanderson.com  What is the study that looked at the effect of the construction on out of state visitors and tourism? How did the study report the effects for winter and skier traffic for the out of state tourist? How was the effects for the summer tourist traffic reported? I am involved in a business that relies on tourists and many are from out of state. What is going to be the effect of the construction on my income?  From: Henry K Anderson Jr Reply-To: mailto:smoky@smokyanderson.com	Online
Categorized Comment	66	Anderson, Henry K.	Public	1/12/2005	1. EIS took years to put together, the amount of time for city and county representatives should be at least 180 days. What will be done about this?  2. There is not a complete study about the economical impact in this corrior upon tourist businesses and the effect of the construction. How will this be addressed?  3. Mass transit must be addressed in this construction. It seems that the costing that are suggested by CDOT are not correct. We must keep pace with technology. Why can't we be advanced and build mass transit?  4. Construction priorities should address the areas of the Corridor where we have safety problems. Where are the most accidents? Will CDOT begin construction in these areas?	Form
Categorized Comment	330	Anderson, Henry K.	Public	2/9/2005	1. What alternative will be safest for traffic regarding the rockfall on Georgetown-Silver Plume Hill?  2. What alternative will have the least effect on the hazardous material of the old mine and mill sites?  3. What alternative will have less truck traffic? Have you considered a train that would ferry trucks, cars, and other vehicles thru the corridor?  4. What alternative will have the least noise pollution?  5. What alternative will have the least amount of air pollution?	Form
Categorized Comment	206	Anonymous Comment Sheet Stamped 02-02-2005	Public	2/2/2005	I am disappointed that the mass transit options of light rail or monorail or even railroad utilizing present track have not been explored fully before dismissing as too costly. The citizens have shown their support through initiatives particularly for light rail. Widening the mountain highway will be more costly in the long run. Safety, with more destabilization of the mountain walls, is a huge consideration. We have already seen the consequences in the Glenwood Canyon. Just preserving and securing the road we have is enough of a challenge. We own a second home in Silverthorne - the highway noise is already a problem - it will become unbearable with six lanes.	Form
Categorized Comment	128	Anonymous Comment Sheet Stamped 1-26-05	Public	1/26/2005	I live in the Vail Valley. I have to contend daily with I-70, its noise, pollution, and impact on my community's health and well being. Expansion of this highway, I-70, is only to enable multi million dollar corporations to make even more money. The expansion of I-70 will not profit the local person raising a family in this area. The expansion will only allow more rude and obnoxious tourists to further harrass and deface our properties. No good will be had by having greater access to our area unless you work for Vail Resorts. I do not and would not work for such a corrupt organization. I hope CDOT is being well paid, under the table (of course), to help them make more money. Aren't you suppose to aid the "Common Good" and not the money grubbers?  Hey, built the highway by your house in stead of mine!	Form
Categorized Comment	116	Anonymous Speaker Grand Junction	Public	1/19/2005	I mentioned to them years ago there was a proposal to build an alternative to I-70 through Nine Mile Canyon out of Boulder, up through the Indian Peaks area, down by Lake Granby, down to U.S. 40 by Granby, and along that way to Kremling, and then over through to Wolcott, you know, by Straight Bridge and everything, and it would have cost less than drilling the tunnels at I-70 to build the whole damn road. It would have required two little short tunnels at the Indian Peaks area that wouldn't even have required any ventilation, they would have been natural.  I think that should be one of the alternatives that they look at now.  It would go through south of Rocky Mountain National Park. And the other point I was talking to them about is what steps are they going to take to make sure that they don't have the slipshod construction that they had on I-70, like the bridges at Vail, on Vail Pass. The bases cracked, and the taxpayers ate it because the highway department signed off on the thing.  And the pavement between Rifle and DeBeque, within a couple of years after they paved it they had to resurface it because of slipshod construction.  And, also, I mentioned as long as they have all these highway needs, bridges need repaired, rebuilt, these kind of things, they shouldn't be spending any money, federal mandate or otherwise, on yuppie bike trails. That ought to come out of parks and recreation money.  And they almost lost federal funding because of a DUI -- the change in the level for DUI. They should be doing that on that federal mandate instead of building bike trails. That ought to come out of parks and recreation, not out of highway money.	Transcripts

And I'll throw in a couple of extras. Instead of the monorail through the canyon there, I suggest that they use the train and go through and have a loading and unloading area there by Dotsero, and the people -- and I even gave them a name for it, the Yuppie Scuzball and Ski Bum Railroad, because they think some of the ski areas are some of the ones pushing real hard on getting the thing.

Okay.

I almost forgot. About a year ago, I don't think it was last summer, but summer before then, they had a thing where they were talking about having an autotrain from Grand Junction to Denver for tourists, but it also could serve local people going from here to Denver if the weather is bad and all that stuff, and if there was a terminus in Grand Junction, they could have it all loaded and go on over to Denver.

The Amtrak autotrain from, I think, Gordon, Virginia to Miami, Florida is very profitable. It's one of the few profitable deals that Amtrak is doing, and they should be thinking about doing that because of the snow slides, the rock slides, the snow, and all the rest of the things.

I think it would be a very popular tourist attraction, but it also would relieve some of the traffic on I-70 if it was done -- if there was one going each way every day, and it would be summer or winter, or a year-round thing, I know I would do it.

Thanks.

Categorized Comment	729	Anton, Jerry	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action - fix 'choke' points, modify travel demand (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	361	Arnolo, Adam	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Good evening. My name is Adam Arnolo. I am from Loveland, Colorado, also, currently. Just a quick note. I came from Raleigh in 1967. I've seen a few changes since then. They haven't all been good. Some, certainly.</p> <p>I want to share something with you. When I came to Colorado in '67 to find [INAUDIBLE DUE TO COUGHING] a beautiful mountain area and had a great time. I moved away for a while and lived in a city that's crisscrossed with six lanes of traffic, and it's all bogged down. Build them, they'll fill them. I saw it over and over again.</p> <p>I also noted that there was some very proactive people in the city government that instituted a light-rail trolley system. And it would not meet the capacity -- we could not build enough of them soon enough. They would fill also during -- they were all filled every day; whereas, the trolleys were filled, but none in a manner that was, let's say, negative. People could enjoy socializing, studying, reading the newspaper, relaxing while they were traveling. That was certainly a different outcome as opposed to fighting the traffic.</p> <p>I have one more thing to say. It's the natural resources that count in this state. Move away for a while, you'll wake up to the fact that the natural environmental -- one of the best ways we can preserve that environment is to leave the smallest footprint possible.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	187	Avery, Mark	Public	2/15/2005	<p>Here's a thought...</p> <p>Why don't you folks keep killing people with girders? That will keep the roads clear. Plus, you can just keep going about your business as if nothing happened, with no one held accountable.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	134	Axtell, Kay	Public	1/12/2005	<p>My name is Kay Axtell, for the record. And I have been a resident of Clear Creek County for 35 years.</p> <p>I moved here when I-70 came through before, and I remember it being built. The comment was: This will be obsolete soon. It's obsolete now. Now I'm hearing that you want to build another highway that will be obsolete in 15 years. Why should you repeat this mistake?</p> <p>My main concern is one that's already been addressed by Harry Dale, and it's the issue of what this impact is going to do to tourism for Colorado regarding issues during the construction years. Work will be done during off-peak weekend hours to minimize disruption to travel to the resort areas. My question to CDOT is: Even if minimized, how will weekend travel times during 15 years of construction compare to today's travel times? And I'll agree that that is a new study.</p> <p>And another question -- or another issue is: During the weekend construction hours, how will travel time compare to today's travel time? Now, I'm hearing that that has been discussed in the study. I did some research on the Web. The Colorado Tourism Office states that tourism is vital to the stability and economic growth of the state and contributes more than 7 billion each year to the state's economy. More than 250,000 Colorado jobs are tied to tourism. It's one of the top employers in Colorado's -- in Colorado. It's one of the top employers in Colorado.</p> <p>And without the travel-generated cash that's made, locals will spend \$150 more a year to meet the services that we have. So I'm asking you to consider the citizens that live in Colorado and the citizens of this county and the citizens of the entire United States who love to recreate here.</p> <p>In response to my fellow Colorado natives, it's my understanding that if the rapid transit goes through over I-70, that that will not preclude people from driving themselves there as well. So he could probably drive his boat over while people are using mass transit.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	157	Babbitt, Cindy	Public	2/9/2005	<p>My comment is this: keep what we have in highways and maintain them - do not enlarge or build new ones. Use the train tracks and install commuter trains (electric or ? any type of fuel as long as it is organic and renewable) Our world needs to move away from petroleum products as we are polluting the environment that supports us for profit means. What good is all the money in the world if you cannot live in it!</p> <p>I hope this is taken seriously! We need to be careful on how we impact the planet we live in.</p> <p>Thanks Cindy Babbitt</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	150	Bair, Chip	Public	1/12/2005	<p>You guys are good. You guys are great. You've covered everything. You got to be looking long-term here, and 20 years is not long term. This is a project that you're projecting to take 15 to 20 years. You've got to be looking out past there.</p> <p>You're going to stop things -- I've been in business in this community for 30 years, and you stop us and do what you're doing, it is not going to be good for this community or the state, and you really have to be looking forward -- much more forward than what you're looking at.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	313	Bair, Chip	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Hi. My name is Chip Bair. I've been in business here in Clear Creek County for a little over 30 years, that small pizza parlor down in Idaho Springs is it.</p> <p>Actually, when I first heard about this proposal of widening the highway and taking out -- at that point I remember talking about, looks like they'll probably take out the parking lot behind my restaurant. And I said, Well, that sounds pretty good. Maybe then I can get a drive-in window right off the highway. So I'm here to lobby for that at this point, because that could perhaps help out the business a little bit.</p> <p>On more of a serious note, though, you got a lot of things -- you've got to do something about this highway. I've been watching it for 30 years. And it used to be when we had a snowstorm, the highway would get backed up, and it would get really busy and it would be good for business. Today it's backed up all the time like it used to be, and it's getting bad for business.</p> <p>We really have to solve this. But we have to think about the future. And it can't be just 25 years, because as everybody's said, it's obvious, you know, the traffic's going to be going up. We've got to look at a mass transit solution because highway is not the answer anymore.</p> <p>I was listening to NPR this morning, and they were talking about something that we haven't been talking about today: Gas. Gasoline, folks. We have a changing paradigm in our world today, and gasoline is at the center of it. It's at the center of the world war on terrorism. It's going to be the center for the future of this country. And we better start thinking about it.</p> <p>China has just signed deals with Iran. They just signed deals with Venezuela [INAUDIBLE DUE TO COUGHING]. That 1.5 billion people over there is going to start demanding the gas supply that we've been using. You add that with India and their billion people and their emerging economy, they're</p>	Transcripts

expected in the next 20 years -- I believe that's the number. I could be mistaken, 15 or 20 years -- that they're going to increase the demand on oil by 40 percent of what we're doing right now. There's not enough oil to go around. OPEC is drilling everything -- or pumping everything they can.

We need to start thinking about alternative solutions. And by the time this is done, we're not going to have enough gas to fill up the highway anyway.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	548	Bair, Frank	Public	5/23/2005	<p>Why is the document looking only 25 years out...(50 years should be the shortest planning threshold) when your own study shows that the latent demand will already have reached capacity at the end of the 15 year construction period.... in other words.. CDOTS own projections confirm that in 2025..we will be no better of than we are today..and in fact..more damage to the environment, economics and loss of community will have taken place, and we will be anticipating yet another round of potential construction. With 15 years of construction the mountains which generate billions of dollars of revenue for the state will become a depressed area the skiers will go to Utah or Calif. or someplace else instead of Colorado. There will be a paradime shift which will take decades to chage. Although this is an environmental study, the only criteria for choosing the "preferred group of alternatives" was cost and technical feasibility. The environmental impacts were not used to choose the preferred group.</p> <p>The I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition (31 jurisdictions) met on May 19 and created a "Regionally Preferred Alternative. The alternative calls for planning and development of transit to proceed with highway improvements that address the pinch points first. Improvements are grouped in 4 phases, with evaluation between phases to determine whether to proceed to the next phase of highway improvements</p> <p>GIVE THIS PROPOSAL FULL EVALUATION. WE BELIEVE IT WILL HAVE THE LOWEST LEVEL OF IMPACT TO OUR ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITIES.</p> <p>Frank Bair Beau Jo's</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	659	Baker, Beverly and Tony	Public	5/16/2005	<p>May 16, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>We are writing regarding the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for transportation improvements in the I-70 corridor from C-470 to Glenwood Springs.</p> <p>We believe that the primary value to be considered in updating the I-70 corridor must be environmental protection. Adopting a plan based mainly on monetary considerations is short-sighted.</p> <p>Based on environmental concerns, we urge the adoption of a Fixed Guideway Transit System using a rail technology as the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>We urge no six-lane highway improvements, but we do support selected highway improvements.</p> <p>Three of our environmental concerns are as follows. One, more lanes will cause health impacts from vehicle air pollution. Two, more traffic and lanes mean more damage to water quality, rivers and wetlands, plus wildlife habitat will be fragmented. Three, hazardous materials, such as heavy metals, will be released when millsites in Clear Creek County are disturbed by highway construction.</p> <p>Colorado is famous for its beautiful environment. We urge CDOT to help keep Colorado's environment both beautiful and healthy by adopting I-70 improvements that respect and support these qualities.</p> <p>Sincerely, Beverly and Tony Baker 736 Maxwell Avenue Boulder, CO 80304</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	608	Baldwin, Kelly	Public	5/24/2005	<p>I am opposed to the widening of I-70 to 6 lanes. Widening will not solve the problem in the future. Not only does it have the most environmental impacts along the corridor of all the potential solutions, but it will also be as ineffective as the current 4 lanes in bad weather. A wreck or a bizzard that stalls 2 lanes now will stall 3 lanes just as well. This would not happen with a good mass transit alternative, such as the advanced guideway system or advanced railway system. In addition, an additional lane will only bring more vehicles up to Summit and Eagle counties, and we have less and less space to put the vehicles that currently come here. Parking for vehicles on busy weekends is already an issue. And free parking is becoming less and less available every year.</p> <p>It is time to think and plan outside the box. Look toward what will work in the future rather than beefing up what already doesn't work currently. Please take some consideration of the environment for a change, and the people who live along the corridor. An advanced guideway system would have an ROI, it would travel in almost all weather conditions without impacting traffic on the existing 4 lanes, it would be the least impactful, and it would be a tourist draw - there isn't another one in the US. And the residents of the mountain communities would utilize it. We have no desire to bring our vehicles down to the front range anymore and deal with the traffic and parking there.</p> <p>With gas prices on the rise and unlikely to come down in the future, the public will begin to see the benefits of using mass transit.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	654	Baltzer, Chuck	Public	5/8/2005	<p>Environmental Support Services P.O. Box 1087 Evergreen, CO 80437 Phone: (303) 670-9948 Fax: (303) 670-6207</p> <p>May 8, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>Thank you for the professional job you and CDOT have done in providing interested public participants such as me with the opportunity to review and comment on the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS). Preparation of the DPEIS was clearly a daunting task as evidenced by the amount of effort required for its review. With such complex multidisciplinary projects it is quite an easy matter to veer off course in one or more aspects, and the DPEIS is no exception to this precept.</p> <p>After reviewing the document, listening to public comment and participating in work groups with my fellow Clear Creek County residents, it is my firm belief that numerous issues can be addressed by a relatively simple course correction. Thus, the purpose of this correspondence is to provide CDOT with comments directed at a broad course correction that very likely will address a great number of public comments that have formed around these issues.</p> <p>Comment #1: The DPEIS provides only one group of alternatives that specifically address the project "need." As a result, the purpose is not fulfilled.</p> <p>Federal regulations at 40 CFR 1502.13 require the following: The statement shall briefly specify the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action. Implicit in this requirement is that the alternatives must be developed in a manner that specifically addresses the need.</p> <p>Page 1-1 indicates that the purpose is to determine the future capacity, mode choice(s), and general location(s) of the preferred alternative. Put in other words, the purpose is to determine what to build, where to build it, and how big to build it. The stated need is to increase capacity, improve accessibility and mobility, and decrease congestion. This all culminates in the statement that Alternatives would meet the underlying need by addressing capacity deficiencies, providing I-70 users with transportation mode choice(s), reducing hours of congestion, and improving travel time.</p> <p>Page 1-40 provides a summary Purpose and Need figure that defines capacity deficiencies primarily as any mainline location with more than 365 hours (4%) annual congestion of queuing during the 2025 baseline condition. This criterion is exceeded in two locations—between C-470 and Silverthorne, and a short reach of westbound traffic at Dowd Canyon. The Dowd Canyon issue is described as related to localized rush-hour traffic. Local issues require local solutions and should not influence alternative development for the entire Mountain Corridor.</p> <p>Therefore, meeting the purpose and need, as defined in this DPEIS, would require CDOT to evaluate</p>	Written

capacity increases using mode alternatives only in the C-470 to Silverthorne segment of I-70. A component of each alternative transportation mode would include localized highway improvement to localized interchange and rush hour issues occurring along the remaining short segments of the corridor.

It appears that only the highway widening alternatives are specific to capacity increases in the C2470 to Silverthorne congested segment, with localized improvements where such action is warranted. Transportation mode alternatives, including Fixed Rail, provide increased capacity that extends far beyond the C-470 to Silverthorne segment where need is shown. The commensurate cost increases associated with building beyond the need results in a determination that the alternatives are not "reasonable" and thus are not subject to further consideration. This resulting determination defeats the project purpose by removing transportation modes necessary to meet the purpose of the DPEIS. Building the alternative transportation modes only in the area of need may very well bring those alternatives back into the realm of "reasonable."

Comment #2: The alternatives provided in the DPEIS are not comparable. Therefore, the affected environment and environmental consequences are not comparable. This defeats the purpose of an EIS.

Federal regulations for Environmental Impact Statements include requirements for alternative comparisons such as:  
[The EIS] should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options (40 CFR 1502.14);

The environmental impact statement shall succinctly describe the environment of the area(s) to be affected or created by the alternatives under consideration (40 CFR 1502.15); and,  
For environmental consequences, the discussion will include the environmental impacts of the alternatives including the proposed action (40 CFR 1502.16).

CDOT has done a reasonable job of providing the requisite comparisons at a programmatic level. There are some shortcomings that would normally require additional effort before finalizing the document, but such an effort is pointless. This is because the comparisons are irrelevant when the alternatives are not comparable. Specifically, the highway widening alternatives are designed to address only the project need. Thus, discussions on direct and indirect impacts from this alternative are relevant. Transportation mode alternatives allow for construction that extends more than twice the distance beyond the stated project need. Naturally the direct and indirect impacts, as well as operation and maintenance costs, may be double that needed to meet the project need. As a result, the requirement for sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options is defeated. Therefore, alternatives that are not limited to address only the project need must be reconfigured to address the project need prior to comparing the alternatives.

Conclusion: CDOT must reissue the DPEIS with the alternatives reconfigured so that each alternative specifically meets the project need.

It is possible to provide a substantial body of comment on the existing environment and environmental consequence sections of the DPEIS. Such comments would include pointing out the fatally deficient discussion on the irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources as required at 40 CFR 1502.16. Or more obviously the substantial increased impacts of a widened highway footprint (when compared to other alternatives) on flora, fauna, streams, cultural resources, abandoned mines and a National Priority List Superfund site, the costs of which are not adequately addressed in the DPEIS. But this effort is of no value until every alternative provided can be shown to address the project need.

For example, designing alternative modes of transit to extend any distance beyond Silverthorne is not consistent with the project need. In the case of this DPEIS, the distance of construction beyond the need is double that defined by the need. This approach can artificially double costs and impacts. A combination alternative that involves two different modes of transit, each of which separately addresses the project need, is another form of doubling the costs and impacts. Except that this approach provides the doubling within the area of defined need.

Alternatives such as the Fixed Guideway Transit meet the need in a far more effective way if the Fixed Guideway terminates at Silverthorne and the highway improvements are applied to points father west. These adjustments to the alternatives must be completed before submitting the DPEIS to public review, and certainly before making purpose and need-based decisions on modes of transit that are applicable to the I-70 Mountain Corridor. The underlying information necessary to redesign these (and other) alternatives into a configuration that meets the project purpose and need is clearly available based on the analyses provided in the DPEIS. Thus, it only remains for CDOT to take the initiative and reissue the DPEIS as a document that provides alternatives that meet the need so that meaningful comparisons of these alternatives can be made. Given the existing and projected future transit challenges along the I-70 Mountain Corridor, it is imperative for CDOT to expedite this work and provide it to the public for review so that effective corridor improvements can begin at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,

Chuck Baltzer  
Environmental Support Services

Categorized Comment	164	Baltzer, Chuck	Public	1/15/2005	My name is Chuck Baltzer. I'm a resident of Evergreen. And I want to thank you for this opportunity to again comment on the draft PEIS.	Transcripts
					<p>My review is far from complete, and I need to -- I feel compelled to again point out that access is not readily available -- access to this document is not readily available to residents of Evergreen. And I believe the downtown area would be an appropriate location, such as the library.</p> <p>This oversight must be corrected, because the community of Evergreen must be included in the review process. And I think that's clear enough in the federal regs of basic at 40 CFR 19. I believe that in order to compensate for the oversight, that the comment period should be extended by at least the period of time that Evergreen residents downtown haven't had ready access. And my preference is a little bit longer because it is a large, complex document that's got a lot of information.</p> <p>My second and last comment is directed at the merits of the proposed alternatives, under 40 CFR 1503.3, so it's a specific comment. In my review I discovered an error in the analysis that I'd like to raise. The error applies to both rail with IMC as well as the monorail.</p> <p>The draft document nicely follows regulations issued by the Council of Environmental Quality on identifying the need. The need that was identified was for capacity improvements in the corridor. That's all well spelled out in Chapter 1. The figure at the end of Chapter 1 divides the corridor into ten segments, and the need is showing -- or the volume of the ten sites, plus a 4- to 5-mile lane westbound or thereabout in Dowd Canyon.</p> <p>All of the preferred alternatives have construction that directly address the need in those areas, but the rail and monorail alternatives have construction that far exceeds areas of need, and this disconnect is inconsistent with the NEPA regulations because we do not now have comparable alternatives. The monorail, for example, at the tune of over \$6 billion is being constructed for more than twice the length of the need. Specifically, the monorail is 118 miles; the need's about 55 miles. So we've got more than 60 miles of needless construction, 60 miles of needless environmental impacts, and 60 miles of needless costs.</p> <p>So this problem must be fixed before you issue a final environmental impact statement without a revised draft of a supplement that can be found at 40 CFR 1502 regulations. The revision must reconfigure the monorail -- I see you. The revision must reconfigure the monorail and rail with IMC to meet the needs and not extend beyond the needs. I believe that not reconfiguring these alternatives is literally paving the way to an appeal being filed on your document.</p>	
Categorized Comment	122	Baltzer, Chuck	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Thank you. I really appreciate the opportunity CDOT has provided to us to comment on the EIS -- I'm sorry -- the draft EIS. My name is Chuck Baltzer, and my address is on the form that I filled out here. And I'm a resident of Evergreen living in Clear Creek County.</p> <p>My first comment is that CDOT did not provide a public review copy of the draft preliminary EIS for Evergreen residents to review in an easily accessible location. We would have to drive to either this high school, if it happened to be open, or up to I-70 Springs. So I really believe that in order to comply with public review requirements of NEPA, and since Evergreen residents are significantly impacted by the I-70 corridor, that the -- and the environmental impact study should have been provided to the Evergreen Public Library or some location more central. So that is my first request.</p> <p>The second, which is, since we in Evergreen have been overlooked for 30 days now, I would like to see an extension to the commenting period of at least 30 days, preferably more like 60 more days, because it is -- as Mr. White had commented, it is a document that is rich with information and is going to take a substantial amount of time to understand it at a level that can generate any useful comments.</p> <p>Since this is the first of ten public hearings, our comments are going to be a little less detailed than hopefully what you'll see in the future. And as the comments are more detailed, you might want to provide a podium to people for their materials.</p> <p>My only substantial comment that I could actually fit together with the ten days that I've had access to the EIS is that I have a concern for how the costs have been used to identify what is a reasonable alternative with the number of \$4 billion, which was just demonstrated up on the screen here, being the cutoff for the alternatives greater than 4 billion, it was out; if it was less, then it's in.</p> <p>The way that the costs are established in the EIS is not clear. So since cost is the number one criterion for selection or the refusal of the alternatives, we need to be very clear, as the public reviewing the</p>	Transcripts

document, how costs were established.

And I'll leave it at that and develop a comment in writing for later submittal.

Categorized Comment	645	Jefferson County Historical Commission	Counties	5/20/2005	Jefferson County Historical Commission Golden, Colorado  May 20, 2005  TO: Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 E. Colfax Ave. Aurora, CO 80011  RE: I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS Comments  As a designated representative of the Jefferson County Historical Commission (JCHC), I am submitting the following comments on the 1-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). The JCHC is a group of community members with interest and expertise in historic preservation who are appointed and overseen by the Jefferson County Commissioners. The JCHC appreciates the opportunity to review the draft document and provide what we consider substantive comments on the Cultural Resources sections.  We have first provided comments on the revised cultural resource survey report because we believe those comments carry over to the Draft PEIS. Comments on the Revised Reconnaissance Survey of the Interstate 70 Mountain Corridor Between Glenwood Springs and C-470 in Colorado (2005) Page 4-2, Table 4-1: To the best of our knowledge, Jefferson County was not contacted for information on historic preservation concerns. We suggest that the Planning and Zoning Department and the JCHC be contacted for input on historic properties or cultural resources before the PEIS is finalized.  Page 4-4, paragraph 2 states: "The study area for the windshield survey extended from Glenwood Springs (milepost 116) to the Clear Creek-Jefferson County line (approximately milepost 247) along 1-70." However, the area of potential effects (APE) extends to milepost 260 at C-470 in Jefferson County. We question why the windshield survey omitted Jefferson County resources.  Page 4-81, Sections 4.6.4 and 4.6.5: These sections state that no local input was obtained or received from Jefferson County consulting parties. However, we are not aware that input was requested from the JCHC or Planning and Zoning.  Comments on the Draft PEIS  General comment: The Cultural Resource sections appear to concentrate on the historic structures along the I-70 corridor. Not much analysis is devoted to potential impacts to prehistoric and historical archaeological sites that cannot be viewed from the windshield of a car. Page 3.15-2, paragraph 2 states: "All local and county governments with historic preservation ordinances or boards were also contacted, including CLGs, to identify sites of local interest that have not been inventoried." Although Jefferson County is not a CLG, it has a Historical Commission that operates under the auspices of the County Commissioners and works closely with the Planning and Zoning Department to review referrals on potential historic properties. It is our understanding that the JCHC was not contacted for information for the Draft PEIS. Please submit a request to JCHC for review of historic properties before the PEIS is finalized.  Page 3.15-8, Table 3.15-1 lists sites within Jefferson County that are listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. However, according to the analysis, none of the sites appears to be potentially impacted by any of the alternatives. JCHC finds it unlikely that there will be no physical or noise impacts to any of the 11 sites. Please review the Jefferson County sites and reanalyze potential impacts. Page 3.15-8, Reconnaissance Survey Sites section: See comment above re: Page 4-4, paragraph 2 of the cultural resources report.  Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments that we believe to be crucial to a fair and unbiased analysis of resources in our county.  Respectfully Submitted,  Lucy Hackett Bambrey Jefferson County Historical Commission Historic Preservation Committee <th>Written</th>	Written
Categorized Comment	727	Barker, Helen	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion), Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  helen barker 154 hillside drive silverthorne, co 80498 helen_barker@bigfoot.com	Written
Categorized Comment	766	Barron, Rod	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  Build heavy rail to carry trucks and cars from Denver to follow the old rail right of way over Boreas Pass, past Breckenridge, and past old Camp Hale and on toward Grand Junction. People and cars could be dropped off for ski resorts along the way. Through traffic avoids I 70 through the mountains by riding the train. This reduces pollution, traffic, and danger to the public. This heavy rail follows a route well south of the I 70 corridor. The difficult and obstructive construction is avoided. Rod rodbarron@earthlink.net	Written
Categorized Comment	88	Bartlett, Jim	Public	1/12/2005	The \$4.0B threshold figure is unsubstantiated, arbitrary, and lacks authoritative basis. Further investigation into this (at the PEIS meeting) revealed that the figure was only "one man's opinion," at best! The \$4.0B figure was applied to the alternatives in such a manner to exclude the most attractive alternative - the AGS (monorail).  As an engineering professional and a citizen who is sensitive to the environment and Corridor economies, I must insist that the monorail system is the ONLY viable solution to Colorado's problem! You must stop listening only to the "highway men" (Government and lobby groups). Listen to the public and act accordingly - they will be paying the bills!  Monorail technology is very real today and the cost continues to decrease from early projections. All things considered, it must be our preferred solution. Get a solid project figure, and let's figure out how to get it done!	Form
Categorized Comment	82	Bartlett, Jim	Public	1/24/2005	As I sat in the westbound I-70 ski traffic Saturday morning, I had plenty of time to think about the PEIS and observe my surroundings.  As a highly-educated engineer and citizen, I have already made my comments well-known online and at public PEIS meetings. We live in beautiful place with great environmental and community sensitivities along the I-70 corridor. All things considered, you must place the AGS (monrail) system as top-choice and the ONLY choice!  Fifteen years of highway widening is simply unacceptable. It will crush Colorado, not to mention the tiny economies along the corridor. The monrail would not have to follow I-70 precisely. It could deviate and wind through the mountains in acceptable locations while preserving the I-70 traffic flow. Costs for your transportation solutions all include a third bore at the Eisenhower. It's time to think "outside of the lines": With today's monorail technology (yes, it really exists) and proper design management of grades and approaches, I believe it's possible to go OVER the Divide WITHOUT a third bore! Cost savings would be enormous. At the very least, if deemed necessary, a special bore could be punched for the monrail higher on the Divide. This would be considerably shorter, cheaper and would not interfere with tunnel traffic.  The monrail could be utilized 24/7. Special off-hours "cargo trains" would wisk loads across the Divide, conceivably from DIA to the West Slope. Wouldn't FedEx Ground love this!  Monorail expandibility in the future would be very realistic with the addition of switching stations. Spurs to Steamboat, Vail or Colorado Springs would all be possibilities.  Alternative sources of fuel are on everybody's minds. Hydrogen is already being used in buses (foreign	Online



countries). As technologies evolve that permit solid-state storage of hydrogen, and infrastructure evolves for safe and efficient distribution, the electrically-powered monorail as we envision it today could possibly be retrofitted to hydrogen power. Hundreds of millions are being spent by large companies today on R&D to make this all possible.

Thanks for listening about the AGS monorail as Colorado's ONLY I-70 solution. I hope somebody really reads this stuff instead of storing it in your database.

Jim Bartelt BSEE, PE  
Evergreen, CO  
303-670-3870

jbartelt@att.net

Categorized Comment	34	Bartelt, Jim	Public	1/11/2005	Corridor Solution	Online
	<p>After spending \$23M and 15-years to arrive at your conclusions, I doubt if my insight will make much difference, but here it is anyway:</p> <p>We all know that the I70 West corridor is a transportation problem of major proportions affecting our citizens, visitors and our very economy. The problem will never go away, and it must be treated with an elegant solution with great vision for the future to be successful. The problem has been "swept under the rug" for so long that it cannot be alleviated with technology and solutions that may have been appropriate twenty years ago.</p> <p>I believe the ultimate solution should be "open-ended" with expandability and flexibility to meet transportation requirements for the generations who follow us. I'm afraid that blasting granite walls and moving mountains to make way for additional traffic lanes is both old technology and closed-ended. By the time new lanes are paved, it is likely that we will have outgrown them. (LA-style freeway expansion.) We must have great sensitivity toward the environment and the economies of corridor communities. I really think the whole world is watching Colorado and how we choose to solve this dilemma.</p> <p>Colorado has chosen elegant solutions to many of its challenges: DIA, our light rail system, sports venues, TREX, etc. I speak in support of all of these victories.</p> <p>It is time to move the fixed-guideway monorail back into serious contention for the I70 corridor. In my opinion, it is not only a viable solution, but it is the ONLY solution. The technology is very real today as demonstrated in other locations around the globe. It would be safe, effective, fast and environmentally-friendly. Above all, it would be a World Class solution to a very ugly problem. Construction would be relatively rapid with minimal disruption to existing I70 traffic flow. No additional road plowing, paving and mag chloride!</p> <p>Of course, program cost is always an important consideration, but the construction cost estimates of the monorail continue to drop from early projections. In my opinion, the cost thresholds that have been advertised are somewhat artificial, but if we cannot genuinely afford the monorail solution, then I would rather wait in long lines of ski traffic until we can. The political pressures forcing you to consider cheaper, "band-aid" solutions will yield only band-aid results.</p> <p>I urge you to resist lobby efforts from the paving contractors (and others), and the pressures from politicians to just "do something" about the I70 mess. We know the program is already late in its initialization, and it is under intense scrutiny, so we cannot afford to be wrong.</p> <p>Please upgrade the monorail system to be a strong contender and worthy of serious consideration.</p> <p>Personally, and professionally, I would be proud to be involved with the monorail as I believe so strongly in the promise it brings to the table. It is the ONLY solution for I70 and for Colorado. Thank you for listening.</p> <p>Jim Bartelt BSEE, PE Evergreen, CO jbartelt@att.net</p>					

Categorized Comment	81	Bartelt, Jim	Public	1/24/2005	I attended the PEIS review meeting on 1/12/05 at Clear Creek HS.	Online
	<p>It became obvious at that meeting that the \$4.0B cut-off figure was very flimsy without substantive calculations and hard figures to back it up. After talking to knowledgeable people at the meeting, I concluded the figure was "one man's opinion", at best. It's impossible to fathom that such an important number would lack sound basis and then be used to create a program "threshold" for selecting alternatives! The AGS (monrail) approach was rejected as its projected cost exceeded the "arbitrary" threshold!</p> <p>As a professional engineer and deeply-concerned citizen, the PEIS in its present form is unacceptable must be amended. I demand the AGS (monrail system) be restored as the ONLY viable transportation solution for the corridor. I realize our I-70 problem is enormous, and, as such, it requires a world-class solution. Not just blasting granite, paving and tying-up our major east-west traffic corridor for almost a generation! You must be neutral and honest and not listen only to the "highway men" with their strong advocates within government and the strong "crony" paving lobbies! Listen to the comments and outcry from our citizenry. After all, we live here along the corridor and will be paying the bills!</p> <p>The monorail technology is very real (despite our governor's comments) and I am enormously sensitive to any environmental impact and to the economies of our tiny corridor communities. When properly compared to other alternatives (per mile cost, maintenance, etc), I think you will find a very real cost-effectivity of the monorail. A news publication (Canyon Courier) recently cited a dramatic reduction in cost compared to early estimates.</p> <p>When I was in your position evaluating options and costs for enormous projects, I would allow certain variables to "float", then evaluate the preferred options. In this case, I think you should allow your "arbitrary" threshold figure of \$4.0B to "float" without constraint, then re-assess your preferred choices according to the environment and other factors. There is no doubt in my mind that the monorail system would prevail as top-choice. Then you should make a very close and accurate assessment of the new monorail cost. With all things considered, if this is the preferred direction but the cost exceeds \$4.0B, then you must figure "how to get it done"! The financial possibilities are endless and have not been adequately explored. It's your job to get the best system identified and implemented in the least painful way!</p> <p>As you know, the FasTracks project was passed by the voters. This project was politically-motivated and not well thought-out. It basically "snookered" many of us living in the mountains (no I-70 corridor solution), but by carefully integrating the AGS monrail with the FasTracks design across the Metro to DIA, we might be able to reduce overall costs substantially ("The whole is less than the sum of its parts".)</p> <p>Thank you for listening. I hope I am incorrect in my perception that the ultimate I-70 solution has already been decided, and the PEIS with public commentary is no more than a mandated exercise! That would be very wrong indeed!</p> <p>Jim Bartelt BSEE, PE Evergreen, CO 303-670-3870 jbartelt@att.net</p>					

Categorized Comment	641	Canyon Area Residents for the Environment	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/23/2005	25958 Genesee Trail Road. PMB-203 Golden, CO 80401  23 May 2005  Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228  Re: I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS  Dear Mr. Wallace:  The undersigned reside in the Mount Vernon Canyon area through which the I-70 corridor passes. We represent the umbrella organization for the area's homeowners organizations, a former State Senator for the area and the former State Transportation Commissioner for Jefferson County. Our most grave concern is the proposed auxiliary lane for west bound traffic on I-70 up Mount Vernon Canyon. We are opposed to the construction of an auxiliary (climbing) lane. Building this 4th lane would cause tremendous impact to traffic while under construction, have a major negative impact to the natural environment in the canyon that is known as the Gateway to the Rockies and would also destroy acres of natural mountain terrain enjoyed by residents as well as tourists and other highway users. In its	Written
------------------------	-----	---	--	-----------	--	---------

place, please consider traffic management possibilities such as the required use of US 40, the parallel route also in the canyon, for slow-moving vehicles in peak hours. Additional pavement would not be necessary and should not be constructed.

The PEIS proposes modifications to interchanges 259, the Morrison exit, and 256 at Lookout Mountain. We are not aware of any specific designs for either of these sub-projects but would insist that designs be discussed with the residents of this area for input at the earliest time. Any construction must carefully consider impact on the environment and on the citizens of the area.

A parking management plan for the entire corridor would be beneficial and is essential for the Jefferson County portion, which has little suitable land available. The effected communities must be involved in this planning process as well.

It is our strong belief that the citizens of this state feel that a long-range solution for this I-70 corridor requires implementation of a mass transit alternative to the automobile as well as the improvement of the roadway itself. Long-range planning of highway improvements and alternative mass transportation should proceed concurrently. It is essential that any new construction not preclude the implementation of alternative transportation forms. Right-of-way for an alternative form should be preserved as early as possible.

In conclusion, we urge the utmost consideration of the environment, Colorado's most valuable resource, and the impact on existing communities in all planning and implementation of improvements to the I-70 corridor.

Yours truly,

Dick Bartlett, President, Canyon Area Residents for the Environment (CARE)

The Honorable Sally Hopper, former State Senator of this region

Flodie Anderson, former State Transportation Commissioner, Jefferson County

cc: Cecelia Joy, Project Manager  
Colorado Department of Transportation, Region I  
18500 East Colfax Avenue  
Aurora, CO 80011

Categorized Comment	182	Becker, Elle	Public	2/11/2005	<p>We have tripped back and forth on I 70 to ski since 1974 when we first returned after college,as well as before that on holiday breaks. This has been thru the building of the tunnel, the 70 connection to Denver and the addition of Copper to the selection just to mention a few. We now trip up and back either late on Friday evening and Sunday evening or try to get away during the week to make the trip.</p> <p>The hi-way between Georgetown and the tunnel is a sure bet to be stop and go Sat. and Sun. -am and pm and it has even extended to Fri evening and late Sunday as of late. This section is in sore need of widening. The needs of the general population is certainly present and yet one more study or ongoing seems a frivolous waste of funds. Yes,it may mean more people will move to our beautiful mountains,yes, it will mean that those who are already there and making "NIMBY noise" will probably shout louder. We love the mountains,skiing and want it to be enjoyed by others as well. It can not be good for visitors to stand in traffic, loose an entire day of vacation to traffic or just not return.</p> <p>We think that the widening is long overdue! Curt and Elle Becker</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	69	Behrens, Lee	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Extend comment time from 90 to 160?</p> <p>If you do as good as you did in Glenwood Canyon, few would have problems.</p> <p>Fixed guideway (even if not built now but right-of-way preserved).</p> <p>Help with cost of emergency services. CCFA or EMS run more on I-70 than any other.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	75	Upper Clear Creek Watershed Association	Associations & Special Interest Groups	1/13/2005	<p>January 13, 2005</p> <p>Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) Region I 18500 East Colfax Aurora, Colorado 80011</p> <p>Re: Response to I-70 Draft PEIS</p> <p>Dear CDOT:</p> <p>This letter is our initial response to the 1-70 Draft PEIS document released 10 December 2004 for comment. We find that the document is not adequate for the decision-making process that is required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Proceeding with the decision-making process without analysis of the 15-year construction period impacts (2010-2025) may provide a single preferred alternative that will likely have profound adverse consequences on health, safety and welfare of people, communities and businesses dependent on and accustomed to Rocky Mountain spring water from Clear Creek.</p> <p>Our agency is charged under law to protect and defend water quality through a management review process. When we subject the I-70 Draft PEIS to the same scrutiny as other actions in the Clear Creek Watershed, we find that you have not done an adequate job. We base our analyses considering the following factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Highway Reconstruction. Every "preferred" alternative requires an increased footprint of additional ditches and relaxed curve geometry for safety and design speed alterations. Much of the area (a minimum of 37 miles) will require a rebuild of the existing roadbed. Challenges to construction include narrow canyons, huge active rock walls containing metals, intrusion into streams and wetlands, and disturbance of mill tailings and heavy mineral concentrations.</li> <li>2. Cross-country Mobility. It is an enormous challenge to maintain some level of operation on the current I-70 highway during reconstruction and expansion. A much longer construction period than normal is needed. This is exacerbated by the fact that service roads do not exist along significant segments of I-70.</li> <li>3. Travel Demand During Construction. We can expect increasing populations to place more demand for travel through the corridor beyond that experienced now or in the past. The highest water quality impacts are expected during construction from year 2010 through 2025. The overriding purpose and need of the PEIS should be mobility in the mountain corridor during the next 20 years in addition to mobility beyond out to the limit of the design-life of the highway structures; as opposed to just mobility in the year 2025 as with the current baseline standard analyzed in the Draft PEIS.</li> </ol> <p>The PEIS document we require at Tier I would show impacts and mitigation for the 23 mill sites existing in the I-70 right-of-way that would be disturbed to one degree or another by the various alternatives under consideration.</p> <p>Mill(s)/Area Dixie/Hidden Valley Silver Spruce/Exit 241 Sampler, Clear Creek, Gem, Waltham, Big Five, Jackson, Mixell, Ruth/Exit 240 Whale/Exit 238 Hoosac, Dover/Exit 237 Clear Creek/Glipin/Dumont Red Elephant/Lawson Swansea/Empire Junction Commonwealth/Georgetown Lake Centennial/Georgetown Payrock, Mendola, Smuggler, Silver Leaf, Baltimore/Silver Plume</p> <p>These historical sites used mercury and/or cyanide as amalgams. Evidence shows that quantities of these materials were imported to each site and all evidence would indicate that these materials remain. Should these materials be released, it may constitute a "taking" for the water right users dependent on clean water. The public needs to know about such places just as they are informed about Shattuck and other industrial sites in Denver. This is information known to you and should be revealed to the public.</p> <p>We are aware that several alternatives not involving highway widening are "clean" with regard to water quality impacts—most notably Advanced Guideway System (AGS). We suggest that AGS was prematurely removed from the preferred category. Recent Federal Transit Authority analyses show that this system is feasible in the corridor and immediately deployable. This would solve the mobility issue and minimize the significant water quality risk.</p> <p>Given that there are "clean" alternatives, we do not find that waiting for a Tier II analysis is legally sufficient for NEPA standards to be met. Therefore, we require a level of analysis that would allow an informed citizen to understand the water quality issues and the impacts prior to a Record of Decision being issued. Such is not the case in the current Draft I-70 PEIS.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p>	Written

Anne Belerle  
2005 UCCWA Chair

cc: Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment/WQCD  
Congressman Mark Udall  
Federal Highway Administration, attention: Jean Wallace  
US Environmental Protection Agency Region 8

Categorized Comment	572	Bell, Marjorie	Public	5/23/2005	<p>After extensive review of the PEIS document and attending many hearings the past several years I do not feel that CDOT has a grasp on all the many, and varied impacts the preferred alternative of CDOT will have on the Clear Creek Co. corridor. There is no mention of an alternate road into the mountains or the use of the Moffat tunnel to get people to the Western slope. The towns and individual property owners need to know in your tier one what you propose for mitigation of the affected areas. Idaho Springs is significantly important in the history of Colorado and your proposals would be extremely detrimental to the history we are trying to preserve as evidenced by the effect the original construction had on the historic sites. The noise pollution affects all people who reside within the narrow confines of the canyon walls. Air pollution and nowadays even light pollution from highway lighting affect residents. The only reasonable solution would be to plan a mass transit rail system.</p> <p>As for our family we have been impacted by the reconstruction of the interchange of I-70 at exit 243, the construction of the Central City Parkway and the resulting stoplights. Now your current proposal to fix pinch points as a short term solution would again affect us.. It would be the third time this family has been affected by loss of property by CDOT construction.</p> <p>Please take the time to develop a plan which would be an asset and not a detriment to Clear Creek County and the history of the State of Colorado</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	104	Town of Georgetown	Municipalities	1/11/2005	<p>January 11, 2005 Letter #05-001</p> <p>Mr. Jeffery R. Kullman Transportation Director C.D.O.T. Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Jean Wallace, PE Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Dear Mr. Kullman and Ms. Wallace:</p> <p>Please accept this letter as our preliminary comments on the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). We may expand and reiterate upon these preliminary comments prior to the March 10, 2005 comment deadline. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments and we look forward to working with CDOT and FHWA on the optimal solution for the future I-70 mountain corridor.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We would again like to reiterate our request that the public comment period for the PEIS be extended to 180 days, not the 90 days which currently ends March 10, 2005. When one combines all of the files on both CD's that CDOT provided, there are 1377 pages in 11X17 inch format. Ninety days is insufficient time to read, digest, and analyze such an important document, thus the current deadline hinders our ability to use the document in any decision making manner and make adequate comments.</li> <li>2. Our preferred alternative is a high-speed, elevated, mass transit alternative, either the Advanced Guideway System (AGS) in Alternative #3 or some other mass transit alternative. We also support specific, targeted highway improvements to address safety aspects and bottlenecks such as the Twin Tunnels. The expansion of I-70 to six lanes of highway throughout Clear Creek County would expand the detrimental impacts on Georgetown and further erode our historic resources. We do not believe that road building has a long term or significant effect on congestion, but that public transportation or mass transit investments can reduce congestion.</li> <li>3. Another reason for supporting a mass transit alternative such as the AGS is there is some evidence that investments in public transportation projects produce 19% more jobs than does building new roads. The State of Colorado and the FHWA should be very interested in the increased job creation give the current national and state economy. Such information is also evident in Table 3.9-9 on page 3.9-14 of the PEIS.</li> <li>1 "Setting the Record Straight — Transit, Fixing Roads and Bridges Offer Greatest Job Gains", Decoding Transportation Policy and Practice #11 Surface Transportation Policy Project Washington, DC, www.transact.org (copy attached)</li> <li>4. Safety does not appear to be a priority in the PEIS. The Georgetown-Silver Plume Hill has proven to be deadly because of geologic hazards. Geologic hazards are not considered a determining factor for alternative choices in the PEIS. Why not?</li> <li>5. We object to the apparent lack of any life cycle costing analysis in the I-70 PEIS. A search of all 1377 pages of the PEIS and its appendices revealed only one mention of the word life-cycle and that was in relation to wildlife, not costs. Had CDOT and J.F. Sato and Associates performed a rigorous life-cycle costing analysis of each alternative, especially for a longer time frame than 20 years, we believe the cost effectiveness index of transit alternatives would have compared much more favorably with the highway alternatives and the ranking would have been much different. We believe that a comprehensive life-cycle costing analysis of each alternative should be done before a preferred alternative is selected.</li> <li>6. Noise from I-70 is a very important issue to the Town of Georgetown and our residents and property owners. The AGS alternative is one of the most quiet alternatives and other mass transit alternatives are as quiet, so this is another important reason for our favoring of mass transit solutions over building more highway lanes. It is unclear how environmental and community values will be used in the selection of preferred alternatives.</li> <li>7. As Cynthia Neely, the Town's Planning Coordinator at the time, wrote in a letter of August 9, 2001, there are many Section 4(f) resources in the Georgetown area including the Georgetown-Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District, the former BLM lands granted to the Town, Division of Wildlife and the Colorado Historical Society, Georgetown Lake recreation area, and bighorn sheep viewing areas. We are adamantly opposed to any alternative which directly or indirectly harms or diminishes these important resources. We believe that all of the preferred alternatives in the PEIS have an adverse effect on these resources and mitigation costs have not been sufficiently estimated. Mitigation policies for sensitive areas are not established in the PEIS. We are also concerned that there may have been new Section 4(f) resources established in Georgetown since the scoping was done in 2000-2001.</li> <li>8. We do not believe that mitigation on the effects of all of the alternatives on the Town of Georgetown and its residents and property owners is sufficiently addressed in the PEIS. Page ES-50 of the PEIS says that mitigation policies and strategies will be shaped to the preferred alternative as a result of public comment and review of the Draft PEIS and will be presented in the final EIS. However, leaving the evaluation and estimation of costs for mitigation to the subsequent Tier 2 process makes it impossible for us to understand the implications of all the alternatives and difficult for us to make decisions on the different alternatives. We request a clarification of mitigation policies within an Historic Landmark District.</li> <li>9. Impacts during construction are a tremendous concern to the Town of Georgetown and Georgetown businesses. Most of the details to address construction impacts, mitigation, and strategies are left to the Tier 2 studies, so it is difficult for us to comment on the different alternatives if we cannot understand how the construction impacts and mitigation of a 15 year construction process for each alternative might affect us. We request a study of economic impacts of construction on Clear Creek County prior to the selection of a preferred alternative.</li> <li>10. The use of person miles of travel (PMT) in the denominator does not fully take into account congestion caused by truck and freight traffic, thus the denominator is invalid and it skews the use of the cost effectiveness index (ref Section 2.3.7.7 — page 2-114). Much of the traffic generated for mountain resort towns is generated by the vigorous home building industry and the materials and supplies which are trucked into and within the mountain corridor to support this burgeoning industry.</li> <li>11. In December, 2004, Governor Bill Owens announced a five point plan for increased transportation spending, including a new proposal to issue \$1.7 billion of transportation bonds. In a Rocky Mountain News article of December 2, 2004, CDOT spokeswoman Stacey Stegman was quoted as saying "The Transportation Commission and CDOT would want to work cooperatively with our local transportation planning partners to determine their priorities and develop the best possible list of critical projects." We hope that CDOT will follow through on that vital partnership and pay great attention to the Town of Georgetown comments and desires while developing its preferred alternative for the Final EIS. We are opposed to building three lanes in each direction and support a high-speed, elevated mass transit alternative.</li> <li>12. We are concerned whether or not CDOT will need to condemn any private or Town of Georgetown</li> </ol>	Written

land for any of the proposed alternatives. We know that the Toll House (Mine Manager's House) may need to be relocated to avoid conflicts. We are not sure that CDOT's authority to condemn land extends to the Town of Georgetown land inasmuch as we are a Territorial Charter Town incorporated in 1868 before the State of Colorado became a state.

Finally, we have just begun our evaluation of the massive I-70 PEIS document, so we may have additional comments as time goes along. We again reiterate our request to expand the comment period from 90 days to 180 days. Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Thomas A. Bernhoff, Police Judge/Ex-Officio Mayor  
Carla Chiles, Police Judge Pro-Tem  
Coralue Anderson, Selectman  
Lee Behrens, Selectman  
Ernest Dunn, Selectman  
Gary Haines, Selectman  
Robert Hodge, Selectman

Cc: The Honorable Bill Owens, Governor  
The Honorable Mark Udall, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Joan Fitz-Gerald Colorado State Senate  
The Honorable Tom Plant, Colorado House of Representatives  
Tom Norton, Executive Director, CDOT  
Dan Corson, State Historic Preservation Officer  
Clear Creek County Board of County Commissioners  
Holland Smith, Clear Creek County Planner

Categorized Comment	59	Benson, Jim	Public	1/12/2005	<p>My major concern, because it affects me directly, is the Floyd Hill tunnel as my well is over 700 feet deep and roughly in line with the proposed tunnel.</p> <p>Secondly, I highly favor the monorail as it is so much less disruptive during the construction phase.</p> <p>I have a great concern that the construction will be too little and too late. It appears short sighted to only plan for 2025.</p> <p>I will seriously consider moving from the front range if construction will impede access to the mountains for 10-15 years. The mountains are the reason I moved to Colorado over 30 years ago.</p> <p>Would double decking or an entirely new route be feasible?</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	628	Bertucci, Nina	Public	2/9/2005	<p>I am concerned with the impact that blasting may have on the residents that are using groundwater. I also believe the plan to tunnel under Sattleback Mountain is ridiculous because it would drain the wells in that area. Please choose a plan with proven technology that is reliable in winter months. Six lanes will come to a standstill on icy roads if one person loses control of their vehicle and the road is not properly prepped and plowed.</p> <p>Noise is my greatest concern. Please construct sound barriers in the communities close to the interstate. My personal interest is between Dumont and the Highway 40 exit. I am also concerned with frontage road access to the local residents, since we will be impacted by the project for years to come.</p> <p>Widening I-70 is inevitable. What I would like to see is to make the impact as least invasive on local residents. I would like to see sound barriers constructed in the Clear Creek County communities that are near the interstate to dampen the noise. I live in Lawson approximately MM 234.5. I know at the meetings (PEIS) I was told that there would be a decibel study to see if a sound barrier is warranted. Remember the noise bounces off of the massive granite mountain walls, increasing the noise level. I was also told that it is illegal for truckers to use their "Jake" brakes, but it is a constant noise in the Dumont area. Since this is not enforced, the only thing we can ask for as residents is a sound barrier. The project is to last for years, please allow local access to the frontage roads.</p> <p>Whichever plan is chosen in addition to the widening, please choose a plan that will keep traffic flowing in the winter. I'm a little hesitant on the reliability of the bus guideway in the winter. Rail should not be affected by snow and ice.</p> <p>An option that would benefit CDOT is to accept the offer from the gravel pit located at I-70 and 6 Highway. Al Frelkas offered to remove the twin tunnels. The only thing that has to be considered is the transmission tower on the south side of the tunnels.</p> <p>Please construct a sound barrier next to the surrounding communities. My interest is in Lawson between Dumont and the Highway 40 exit.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	33	Birinyi, G.	Public	1/11/2005	<p>I-70 improvement</p> <p>Widening I-70 is the LEAST best idea of the many that have been circulated.</p> <p>I think CDOT needs to get funding the way we did for the football stadium and convention center and etc, etc.</p> <p>CERTAINLY there is still a way to collect the funds needed--even if it means charging a toll or assessing the ski areas a special tax--so that we can install a bullet train, monorail, or light rail type solution INSTEAD of destroying more of the mountains and causing over a decade of misery!</p> <p>That kind of construction will only make matters WORSE, not better!!</p> <p>Back to the drawing board folks, find a better solution.</p> <p>G. Birinyi gbirinyi@aol.com</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	326	Blair, Michael	Public	2/12/2005	<p>Okay, I hate to be the last one holding up everybody, but only maybe two minutes. I'm Michael Blair. I live here in Glenwood Springs.</p> <p>I would first say to those folks who came from over the mountains and out of the area, thanks for coming down and spending your money. We can use it.</p> <p>The second thing is I am a land use planner and been involved in lots of these planning hearings and so forth for a long time. And I get very disappointed and frustrated because we spend an awful lot of money on plans and public meetings and things like that, and very often or too often, things don't get done. So I would say that -- I would like to say that we all support the efforts of CDOT because they have spent an awful lot of time and money, our money, to come up with these plans and something should come up.</p> <p>And how we do that, I think, is for regional or local groups -- I forgot what we call them, anyway -- to publicize more what they're doing and get more local citizens involved so that we can take our comments, whatever they are, and there is certainly a wide range of them, back to CDOT in this relatively short time that we have, and make sure that all of our comments and concerns are really included, not just those few who take the trouble to participate. And that's greatly appreciated.</p> <p>The last thing is that all these ideas, even the goofy ones, may be worthwhile in the future. But they are goofy now because they seem so expensive or just not doable. So I say, as a planner, we should at least design in some of these great ideas so that there's room for them and a schedule for them to be effected or developed in the future.</p> <p>An example is that when we sat on the review groups for I-70 between Eagle and over Vail Pass, that was a long time ago, but there were a number of us that said, Design in rail corridor or some other corridor in the median of the two lanes of the interstate so that we could have either buses or monorail or something in there in the future. Well, the highway department says, We don't have the money to plan for that. And the local folks says, We're not going to pay for it because the government should pay for it. So those good ideas did not get included in the plan. So I really urge people or urge CDOT to include a lot of these far-fetched ideas in the plan so that when the future catches up with us, we might be able to implement them. Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	238	Blamire, Gary	Public	1/26/2005	<p>My name is Gary Blamire. I live here in the Avon Valley.</p> <p>And I only have one comment really, real quick, about the options. One option I didn't see on here that I would like to see evaluated is instead of just people movers is maybe vehicle movers. I think if we could take, you know, the semis off the highway, we could increase the throughput in this valley tremendously. And yet there's no options there for putting them on a train or a rail or whatever and moving them, and I suspect it would be very unpopular with the transportation industry. But I do think it would help now and help in the future.</p> <p>We're going to continue to grow, and the semis going through the tunnel take up a lane themselves, and we only have one lane to go through the tunnel, it seems.</p>	Transcripts

Thank you very much.

Categorized Comment	651	Roaring Fork Transportation Authority	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/17/2005	Roaring Fork Transportation Authority Carbondale Office 0766 Industry Way Carbondale, CO 81623	Written
<p>May 17, 2005</p> <p>Ms. Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Re: Comments regarding I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>We are writing to provide our comments regarding the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS. As staff of cities and transit agencies, we are very interested in the outcome of this PEIS as we work with transportation issues everyday. In our view, too much emphasis has been placed on expanding the highway in the PEIS. We worry that expanding the highway for the entire Corridor, in the absence of substantial other modal investments, might induce excessive vehicular travel along the Corridor and in the adjacent communities, causing congestion similar to pre-expansion levels of traffic. Studies by the American Public Transportation Association and the Federal Transportation Administration have proven that highway widening alone serves to accommodate congestion for two to three years, but may actually encourage more auto traffic in the long term. Congestion related to highway expansion has the potential to impact the roadways in the local communities, and therefore the expansion could negatively impact these communities' quality of life.</p> <p>We are concerned that "Build the Highway first and preserve the option for building Transit later" appears to be the theme throughout the document. The capital costs associated with expanding the highway are stated as being in the range of \$3 billion. According to the PEIS, the Transportation Commission has committed approximately \$1.6 billion of the Strategic Corridor Investment Program to the I-70 Corridor." Thus, \$1.4 billion of currently uncommitted funding would have to be secured in order to implement highway expansion. We fear that once this large sum of \$1.4 billion is secured to widen the highway, chances of designating any additional funds to implement transit improvements, whether low-cost or high-cost, will be slight.</p> <p>We would prefer to see a multimodal approach in which highway widening and transit are implemented concurrently. Elements of highway expansion and transit improvements need to be implemented from day one together, to gain the support of all "camps" and do justice to serving the different travel markets. This was demonstrated recently by the success of TREN. Implementing transit and ITS improvements, along with highway widening, would demonstrate CDOT's commitment to multimodal solutions.</p> <p>We believe there are modest cost transit alternatives, some of which are discussed briefly in the Minimum Action Alternative, that should be given more consideration and described in more detail. The Bus in Mixed Traffic option (a component of the Minimal Action Alternative) was estimated to cost \$15 million per year. This \$15 million/year subsidy pales in comparison to the costs of the other alternatives. We also question the costs associated with the Bus in Guideway alternative.</p> <p>We believe that modest cost, easy-to-implement transit alternatives have not been given enough consideration in this study. The transit alternatives in the PEIS err on the side of being rather grandiose, and therefore can be quickly written off as too expensive. For example, AGT/Monorail is rarely implemented for long distance travel due to high costs. We believe that more modest transit alternatives have not been given adequate consideration. For example, the Bus in Guideway alternative has a capital cost of \$3.26 billion to \$3.47 billion, making it one of the most expensive alternatives. Implementing high-frequency bus service in mixed traffic throughout the Corridor is included in the Minimal Action alternative, which is not preferred as a stand-alone alternative. We ask for a re-examination of an alternative of high-frequency bus service operating along the I-70 corridor in mixed traffic as a preferred stand-alone alternative, preferably in an HOV lane in areas where the highway would be widened.</p> <p>Implementing high-frequency bus service in mixed traffic throughout the Corridor would provide valuable ridership data that would help CDOT in deciding whether to spend \$3.26 billion to \$3.47 billion to implement the Bus in Guideway alternative. We believe that the Bus in Guideway alternative is a jump from point A (virtually no inter-city/inter-resort transit service) to point C (a grandiose inter-city/inter-resort transit service). Instead, we believe CDOT should move from point A to point B (a more modest inter-city/inter-resort transit service) and then hopefully to point C.</p> <p>At least ten established transit agencies operating in close proximity to the I-70 Corridor are members of the Colorado Association of Transit Agencies and have been receiving federal and state funds over the last ten years. These include the Summit Stage, Town of Breckenridge, Town of Vail, Eagle County Transit (ECO), Ride Glenwood Springs, Steamboat Springs Transit, Snowmass Village, and the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority. The PEIS does not, as far as we can see, take into account the already substantial federal, state and local investment that has been made over the last ten years to establish transit in the communities along the I-70 Corridor. What is missing in the PEIS is an analysis of a relatively low-cost service to link these regional circulators throughout the I-70 Corridor and adding frequent, reliable service from DIA to Vail, and less frequent service to Glenwood Springs. We believe there is a substantial need for improvement in standard intrastate transit service, as witnessed by the success of shuttle service/vans and RTD's Sky Ride. We recommend adding a strong intra-regional trunk service from DIA to Grand Junction. The service we are suggesting would be similar to Greyhound's current service in the I-70 Corridor, but with more frequent service and a focus on attracting tourists, skiers, and intrastate commuters. The service we are suggesting could be operated exclusively by CDOT or as a public/private partnership between CDOT and a private carrier like Greyhound.</p> <p>Thank you very much for considering our concerns. Please note that this letter does not necessarily reflect the sentiment of our elected officials or board members. Because as staff, we weren't included directly in the Coalition meetings, we are providing our comments separately. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions. We would be happy to provide any additional data on ridership or operating costs or any other statistics that you might find helpful.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Dan Blankenship, CEO, Roaring Fork Transportation Authority Kristin Kenyon, Planner, Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (Serving the communities of Glenwood Springs to Aspen and Snowmass Village and to Rifle) David Johnson, Eagle County Transit Planner (Serving the I-70 Corridor, Dotsero to Vail) John Jones, Summit Stage Transit Director (Serving Copper Mountain to Silverthorne to Breckenridge) David Peckler, Town of Snowmass Village Transit Director Alice Hubbard-Laird, New Century Transportation Foundation George Krawzoff, Steamboat Springs Transit Director John Krueger, City of Aspen Transportation Director Lynn Rumbaugh, City of Aspen Transportation Coordinator</p>						
Categorized Comment	49	Blugerman, Jim	Public	1/15/2005	-----Original Message----- From: jim blugerman [mailto:jblug@earthlink.net] Sent: Saturday, January 15, 2005 2:32 PM To: I-70 West Draft PEIS Subject: I-70 Draft EIS	Email
<p>Dear Ms. Joy,</p> <p>I wish to comment that I support the high speed monorail alternative to any other alternative in the Draft EIS. It is less disruptive to build, more friendly to the environment, and will be less expensive for the travelers to use in the future.</p> <p>Jim Blugerman 1714 Clear Creek Dr. Georgetown, CO 80444</p>						
Categorized Comment	703	Bode, Bob	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action - fix 'choke' points, modify travel demand (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>I-70 is not an issue of worker's commuting and should not be supported by taxpayers. Commuting from mountains to Denver should not be encouraged by increasing capacity of the highway. Bob Bode bodeb1@comcast.net 361 N 7th Ave Frisco Co 80443</p>	Written

Categorized Comment	707	Bosserman, Carol	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>The current CDOT plan is without vision. It doesn't take into account the probable demise of the automobile (at least as we know it or imagine it today), the increasing cost of oil, the diminishing supply of oil, and the damage to the environment as we continue to burn fossil fuels. With change occurring at an exponential rate, any plan that does not take into account possible scenarios for up to 50 years into the future is probably not worth considering. A plan must include either some form of mass transit or the possibility that most people may not be able to afford to drive a car in the future. I would like especially to voice strong opposition to 6-laning. Widening highways is a very short-sighted approach. I reference (as many have) the example of Washington, DC, where I lived for many years. 6 lanes will be outdated before they are finished. Thanks for conducting this survey and organizing and taking into account the viewpoint of citizens of Summit County. Carol S. Bosserman 306 W. Lodgepole Dillon, CO 80435 carolbosserman@aol.com</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	576	Bowland, Janice	Public	5/24/2005	<p>As a member of the Idaho Springs Chamber of Commerce for 13 years I feel very strongly that the proposed construction on the I-70 corridor is going to have a great negative impact on our community. Economically many of our small businesses are already struggling, with the proposal of 15 years of highway construction, they may not be able to survive. Not that CDOT cares! The area through Clear Creek County and especially through Idaho Springs is to be more impacted than the other areas. By your own admission, at the end of the proposed construction the highway will be just as jammed (for a few hours each week) as it is currently. This Tome (described in the dictionary as "a book, esp. a large, scholarly or ponderous one") is a \$20+ million study that is way over priced to begin with and whose comparisons are inaccurate and misleading. CDOT expects to go through the motions of holding these public hearings, present the proposals, supposedly take into account the objections, prioritize and then come out with what they wanted in the first place.</p> <p>What the public would like to see is for CDOT to address the "pinch points" which were defined in the I-70 Corridor Coalition meeting held May 19th (with 31 jurisdictions present).</p> <p>We would all like to see CDOT address these issues before releasing the Record of Decision.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	668	Historical Society of Idaho Springs	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/23/2005	<p>The Historical Society of Idaho Springs, Inc. P.O. Box 1318 Idaho Springs, Colorado 80452 (303) 567-4709 or 567-4100</p> <p>May 23, 2005</p> <p>Ms. Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 E. Colfax Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>And</p> <p>Mr. David Nicol, Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration 12300 W. Dakota Ave. Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>RE: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments to the I-70 West PEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Nicol and Ms. Joy:</p> <p>The Historical Society of Idaho Springs, Inc. is a Consulting Party to the Section 106, I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). Idaho Springs is home to hundreds of eligible historic structures that are not yet inventoried or designated, but are eligible for designation and hence subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.</p> <p>The PEIS does NOT meet the purpose and the underlying need that preserves community values and environmental sensitivity. It appears that the only subjects that were considered in determining the purpose and need were the "perceived" technical feasibility and the (short term) cost and available funding sources. Though we believe there are many sections that are fatally flawed in the PEIS, we will direct our comments to Historic and Cultural Resources.</p> <p>1. We believe that Section 106 consultation is seriously flawed within the PEIS and that, alternatives were eliminated within Tier 1 without full knowledge of the potential direct effects to our historic structures and character. A full review of Section 106 properties should have taken place. Screening out of alternatives was totally inappropriate at this level. All alternatives should be brought back into consideration, and a supplement to the PEIS issued.</p> <p>2. The PEIS document itself contains false statements regarding initial consultation (I refer to my letter of June 30th 2004-which I have attached as an official part of the record and these comments.). Consultation with local Historic Preservation Organizations was non-existent, and only a cursory review of designated sites was included in your initial reconnaissance survey. Hundreds of eligible sites were overlooked.</p> <p>3. At our insistence a Revised Reconnaissance Survey was undertaken, that added hundreds of structures, landscapes and view corridors to the APE (which is the agreed upon Ridgeline to Ridgeline). Only Consulting Parties received this addendum -- that should have been sent out to all reviewers of the PEIS. Those who did not have access to the Revised Reconnaissance Survey, were reviewing the document without pertinent information needed to make an educated decision in other words, all reviewers were not given the same information.</p> <p>4. Pertinent indirect effects which may constitute "constructive use" are well-defined, however the PEIS appears to have minimized these indirect effects and not identified potential constructive uses by alternatives. Specifically Noise and Visual effects have been minimized. Noise levels are already above acceptable standards, and View Corridors are already compromised.</p> <p>5. Mitigation strategies are vague. Using a percentage for mitigation with each alternative (when they are all very different) is misleading. Mitigation strategies through Idaho Springs need to include context sensitive design including tunnels, arcades, reversible lanes, ---creative solutions that will mitigate the environmental damage (air, noise, water quality), as well as enhance the built environment and the view corridors.</p> <p>6. Vision. The Major Investment Study (MIS) concluded in 1998, specified a 50 year vision for the I-70 corridor, which included high-speed elevated transit, and certain highway improvements. The PEIS unfortunately adopted a short-sighted approach tied to potential funding sources The Fifty year or even longer, vision needs to be the framework for the future of I-70.</p> <p>7. Four Billion Dollar Cost Ceiling. This is an arbitrary number. Please provide us the basis for this imaginary number. The test of "reasonableness" needs to include the economics/long term cost of destroying, culture, history the environment, and community value and our "sense of place."</p> <p>The PEIS concludes that after 15 years of big highway construction through Clear Creek County, with its potentially devastating economic, environmental, and cultural impacts, there will be no significant congestion relief on I-70. Instead, in twenty years, we will be facing another round of potential Highway Construction and potential WIDENING to eight or 12 lanes.</p> <p>In conclusion the "preferred alternatives" in the PEIS provide the worst case scenario through some of Colorado's most historic areas. The I-70 Corridor should be a magnificent transportation system into and through the Colorado Rockies that respects and honors our history and our natural environment. The Alternatives in the PEIS (as presented) do not accomplish this vision for the future. We urge you to issue a supplement, include equal information for all reviewers, and especially adopt the Regionally Preferred Alternative created by the I-70 Coalition under the aegis of the Northwest Council of Governments.</p> <p>Please don't hesitate to contact me with specific questions, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the PEIS and look forward to the supplement.</p> <p>Regards, Robert T. Bowland, President</p> <p>Co/Mayor Dennis Lunbery, CC County Commissioners, Georgianna Contiguglia, SHPO Dan Corson, Amy Pallante, State Office of Historic Preservation; Carol Legard, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation; Lysa Wegman-French, National Park Service; James Lindberg, National Trust for Historic Preservation; Mary Ann Naber, FHWA-Federal Preservation Officer; US Senator Wayne Allard; US Senator Ken Salazar, US Representative Mark Udall; Colorado Senate President Joan Fitz-Gerald; and Colorado Representative Tom Plant</p>	Written

Categorized Comment	315	Bowman, Marci	Public	2/9/2005	<p>I'm going to be very brief. I would respectfully ask you all to take a little time to look at our website. Our website is: <a href="http://www.i70mtnncorridor-truth">www.i70mtnncorridor-truth</a>. Please take time to look at it. We're changing it and updating it as fast as we can. And I would especially ask you to look at the list of the resources. Harry Dale has worked so hard and has done such a good job. And for our news, Jo Ann has given you a lot of medical review.</p> <p>And, also, just read through what we did. Respectfully, we have some thoughts -- our thoughts on busses. We'd like you to look at those too. Please keep coming back as we add to it, as we update it.</p> <p>And thank you all for coming.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	371	Bowman, Marci	Public	2/16/2005	<p>I'm Marcie Bowman, a Colorado native, York Gulch, Clear Creek County.</p> <p>We have a website. We respectfully ask you to take a look at it. We respectfully suggest that what we have are a lot more accurate -- are some -- some facts, some documents that you'll find a lot more accurate. Please take time to look at the resources. That's the place where we put a lot of these comments that people have been making.</p> <p>We've put a lot of our own evaluation of what some of the things that these people have been doing. So please take time to take a look at it.</p> <p>The other thing that I would like to mention is, for the second time now, CDOT has messed up information when they've given people advertisements about how to get to these meetings. I don't know if this means that you've got a PR person who is incompetent or a staff member who is incompetent. First you give the wrong hours -- the wrong time, and then they gave at Clear Creek -- the Clear Creek channel -- all of the radio stations are giving the wrong locations. I've called and they've corrected this.</p> <p>Now, I would suggest that you look into that because someone, and I'm not suggesting it's you people, of course, but somebody doesn't want folks to know about this.</p> <p>It's an excellent point that they haven't had anything up in Boulder or Longmont or Loveland. They haven't had anything really specifically in Denver, and Denver's going to be hugely impacted. Don't you think those people hike and bike and snowshoe and fish and hunt and ski? Yes. They don't want you driving on the roads. They care.</p> <p>I suggest that if you're going to extend this time, you should also have some public hearings in Boulder and in Denver.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	13	Bowman, Marci	Public	12/28/2004	<p>Those of us who drive on I-70 nearly every day have noticed that it is only very busy for 8 -10 hours A WEEK. During the other 160 hours of the week, traffic moves along at a reasonable rate barring accidents or poor road conditions due to weather.</p> <p>In my humble opinion, it is ludicrous to spend billions of dollars of tax payer money so that a few thousand people won't be inconvenienced twice a week. Most of the bottle necks could be greatly improved with minor tweaking such as a few extra passing lanes and more "Left lane for passing" signs.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	166	Bowman, Marci	Public	1/15/2005	<p>Hello, I'm Marci Bowman from York Gulch. I'd like to start off briefly by saying I'm five miles away from I-70. We watch the road, and it's only busy a few hours a week. We are spending billions of dollars on something that's busy a few hours a week.</p> <p>I have a couple of questions. First, I think that the growing number of experts feel that, as Autumn alluded to, that oil -- we are using our -- rapidly using the oil that's available. Oil will be more expensive. I want to know if you're increasing here costs of widening between the whole six-lane number. If your increased costs are -- if you're factoring in these increased costs of oil in your asphalt and the fact that you're going to have to keep putting asphalt down over and over again, if you're even figuring this in.</p> <p>The next question -- the next comment that I have: If you look at Europe, if you look at Asia, they're looking forward. They're doing things like the AGS. They aren't looking backward. Building a six-lane highway, I'm so sorry, is like putting in -- is like putting in a wagon train, a wagon trail in 1920. Everyone would have laughed at you. Why don't you look forward? I mean, this is the 21st century. We've got to look forward; stop looking back. Look forward. Look at AGS. Look at the realities of it. And it's not looking back -- we're not even going to need it.</p> <p>And I'd like to give the rest of my time to Ed Rapp, if I could.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	229	Bradford, Caroline	Public	1/26/2005	<p>Those of you who know me will be very happy I have laryngitis, so it will be very short tonight.</p> <p>My name is Caroline Bradford. I'm the director of the Eagle River Watershed Council. We have a very strong working relationship with CDOT and are very happy to see Jeff Kullman and Tammy here tonight. Thank you for being here.</p> <p>The work that the Eagle River Watershed does on the Black Gore Creek on Vail Pass has been very rewarding because we actually have succeeded in keeping some of the sand that is necessary to maintain the highway out of Black Gore Creek.</p> <p>Unfortunately, if we continue paving and widening the footprint of the highway, we'll need to put out more sand and will have -- no matter how great the sediment-control action plan is for dealing with that sand, widening the highway is going to be a problem.</p> <p>With that said, as a -- I think that the fixed guideway alternatives and all of the mass transit alternatives are more appealing than simply widening the highway.</p> <p>I do understand that this is a long process, and I've been involved with it for about four years now, and I don't know how you guys do it for this long without having the vision that someone else said is sort of lacking. I do actually think that you have a vision for being able to move people all across the mountains, and I applaud that.</p> <p>And I do understand how difficult it is. I think that the preservation alternatives are very important, that we need to plan beyond 2025. I mean, 2025 is -- you know, we won't have a SCAP in by 2025.</p> <p>And that we need to keep the Idaho Springs constraints of the narrow footprint in mind whenever we go through narrow sections of the highway, that we shouldn't limit those very extensive alternatives to the Idaho Springs area, that they need to be thought of as alternatives in all of the different areas of the highway that are very narrow.</p> <p>Again, we'll do our comments in writing as well, but thank you all for coming up and spending the time on this project and for evaluating everybody's comments here tonight.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	174	Bradley, Christine	Counties	1/15/2005	<p>Thank you. My name is Christine Bradley, and I'm the Clear Creek County archivist.</p> <p>As Ed was saying, these are precisely the chokepoints through which the highway widening would take place. It was for this issue that the Colorado Intermountain Fixed Guideway Authority was created, because it was known at that time that an elevated monorail could be routed to avoid these sites. The public now knows of this issue, and you, CDOT, and the FHWA, must address it with its full costs and health, safety, and welfare ramifications, including detriments and benefits among all alternatives prior to a record of decision.</p> <p>The public needs to know -- you want to do the white hats and black hats? Anyway, the public needs to know that the white hats working to maintain the health of this watershed are Coors, Henderson, USFS, EPA, CDPHE, Clear Creek County, Standley Lake cities and others. We hold the road open and trust you do us no harm; we will not suffer to permit the rape of these waters and mountains.</p> <p>And that's the end of it. But then I have something. Wait. Wait.</p> <p>This is the most low-tech presentation you will see in all of these -- and I'll put it up here for you. This is -- this watershed foundation asked me to work with them last summer to try and determine where there were mill activities throughout Clear Creek County.</p> <p>I worked with an intern from the School of Mines who -- we went through state mine inspection reports, USGS professional papers, newspapers, and the like. The little pins -- the color coding is irrelevant; that was just the only box of pins I could find -- indicate names of different mines and activities. They're centered along the waterway, as we've all said, because that's where the hydropower was. Not all of these are going to be different mills. Some of them are going to funnel down into the same one, but, obviously, there's a tremendous amount of mineral development that was done along that corridor, which is why it's important.</p> <p>And, as Joanna sticks up one minute, let me make two other comments. I wasn't at the hearing on Floyd Hill but would also encourage extension of the comment period and occasionally extension of those time periods. I have visions of my friends and neighbors coming to all of these so they can write chapters of comments in three-minute periods. And, you know, sometimes five probably makes more</p>	Transcripts

					sense. Thank you.	
Categorized Comment	80	Bransky, Harvey	Public	1/12/2005	<p>The studies appear to be flawed. A total disregard of the monorail (AGS) was apparent. Such system would not require more than an approximately 4 to 5 year construction period. The period of traffic and community disruption would be far less than the preferred alternative construction period of approximately 15 years. The socioeconomic concerns would not be of great impact should a monorail system be constructed without the widening of I-70. Such system can be privatized, another plus in favor of the monorail.</p> <p>I would think that there should be additional studies without a de-emphasis or disregard for that which I described above as an alternative worth the additional cost.</p> <p>The widening of I-70 and implementation of the alternative (preferred) would no doubt include property/home condemnations. Such result would be a social injustice under the circumstances.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	487	Summit County Democratic Party	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/11/2005	<p>The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) is proposing under its "preferred alternatives" to spend \$2.4 to \$3.5 billion for I-70 improvements which according to CDOT will take five years to plan and fund, and another 15 years to build. As currently designed, these improvements will probably handle traffic only until 2030. In the meantime, mountain corridor communities will be stuck with more I-70 weekend congestion and 15 years of major construction delays. Negative impact on local business will be substantial. CDOT's preferred alternatives take too long, will disrupt local economies and in the end will solve very little. CDOT has presented no long-term solutions to meet our 21st Century transportation needs.</p> <p>In light of rapidly rising fuel prices, pending worldwide fuel shortages, the national security threat posed by our heavy dependence on foreign oil, and the severe economic and environmental impacts and high tax burden of new highway construction, cities and states around the country are now looking for new transportation solutions.</p> <p>Alternative recommendations</p> <p>(1) Start work immediately to eliminate choke points such as bad curves and poorly designed interchanges. Add passing lanes where most needed. These improvements are long overdue. \$1.3 billion in existing funds is currently available for this work;</p> <p>(2) Implement and emphasize pro-active measures to modify travel behavior, such as credits for nighttime truck travel, increased ridership incentives to bus and van companies and improved traffic information notification systems;</p> <p>(3) Develop a long-term sustainable transportation strategy with solutions that have broad based appeal and can be enthusiastically supported by our entire Congressional delegation to obtain necessary funding from Washington. Mass transit is an essential part of any long-term solution. Other solutions might include business sector plans to attract non-peak period visitors, "easy pass" metering of all vehicles to give monetary incentives for non-peak hour travel, and improved alternative routes for local traffic;</p> <p>(4) Analyze the environmental and public health impacts of new construction in the EIS process, and mitigated during and after construction. Evaluate fully impacts to communities as part of the NEPA process and demonstrate compliance with all state and federal environmental regulations in the preferred alternative. Include specific provisions to account for new technologies in the Record of Decision. Eliminate the arbitrary \$4.0 billion project cap to allow for construction of a sustainable transportation system with at least a 50 year carrying capacity.</p> <p>We call upon Governor Bill Owens, the Colorado Assembly, the Colorado Department of Transportation and the I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition to take the lead by developing a long-term sustainable transportation strategy for the I-70 Mountain Corridor, which can become a model nationwide.</p> <p>Respectfully, The Summit County Democratic Party John Aiden Briggs, Jr., Chair</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	723	Briones, Ernestina	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Yes, I know that the prospect of a mass transit system is daunting, to say the least, has hard to accept costs and might just make the problem worse in the short term HOWEVER, it seems the ONLY realistic, long-term, sustainable option for our state. I can imagine some VERY innovative ways to market the mass transit to Denver and out-of-state tourism to insure that it is used to it's full potential. I hope this option goes through and if so, there MUST be major coordination with the existing public transpo systems so that the new system works 'seamlessly' and is convenient enough for all of us car-addicted folks to opt to use it.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	338	Brown, Bruce	Public	2/16/2005	<p>My name is Bruce Brown. I'm a resident of Evergreen.</p> <p>In general, I'm opposed to the preferred alternative as conceived in the PEIS. I think that the anticipated benefit is not significant enough to warrant the dedication of such an enormous amount of public resources in light of the fact at the conclusion of the build-out the benefit to highway speeds will be negligible.</p> <p>I think that it's important that if there's going to be an additional build-out that these two things be taken into consideration: One is that we secure the money necessary to build it at the inception so that we don't get into a situation where we don't see the project through to conclusion.</p> <p>Additionally, that we only enter into a project that will pay a significant dividend to the communities along I-70 and not just the recreational industry, whether it be the ski areas in the summer or the rafting -- or vice versa, the ski areas in the winter and the rafting in the summer. So that if there is going to be any construction project, that it needs to include mass transit.</p> <p>One successful model for mass transit that I think we need to consider is that which occurs during the football season and people taking buses to the Bronco football games. People seem more than willing to travel in on buses in order to avoid paying stiff parking fees as well as to avoid the congestion that's caused.</p> <p>When you look at the winter travel which goes to a very limited number of ski areas from the metropolitan area, it seems to provide a similar basis to believe that people would again be willing to participate in mass transit -- a proven model of mass transit that I'm using here is buses. And since there's no great technology curve to overcome, perhaps some limited build-out in terms of dedicated bus lanes would be available only during the weekends, during the only period where we're concerned about would be appropriate as far an alternative that should be employed on I-70.</p> <p>And that's the conclusion of my comments. Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	631	Club 20	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	<p>Cecelia -</p> <p>I've attached and pasted below Club 20's comments on the I-70 PEIS. A hard copy of the attachment is in the mail. Thanks again for inviting our comments!</p> <p>Reeves Brown, Executive Director</p> <p>CLUB 20 P.O. Box 550 Grand Junction, CO 81502-0550 (970) 242-3264</p> <p>May 24, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Dept. of Transportation, Region 1 18500 Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Emailled this date to: cecelia.joy@dot.state.co.us</p>	Email



Dear Cecelia:

Club 20, the coalition of Colorado's 22 western counties, appreciates this opportunity to submit comments regarding the Interstate 70 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). We appreciate the exhaustive effort that the Department of Transportation (CDOT) has gone through to engage the public in this PEIS process, and we hope that our comments will be helpful to you in defining the most appropriate course of action for the I-70 mountain corridor. Club 20 appreciates the opportunity to have been involved in the Mountain Corridor Advisory Committee throughout this process.

Club 20 recognizes the importance of a statewide multi-modal transportation system. In pursuing this long-term objective of efficiently moving goods and people, consider the entire spectrum of options available and the relative benefit that each contributes to the objective.

The mountain corridor must be viewed as part of a statewide system. The future demand on the corridor will necessitate solutions that are multi-modal in nature, improve safety, and enhance mobility in the corridor resulting in an overall economic benefit of communities along the corridor and their neighbors off the corridor.

The preferred alternative(s) for the I-70 mountain corridor must be multi-modal in nature and include a combination of highway, transit, air, rail, and non-motorized transportation solutions. Planning across all modes of transport should be concurrent in order to build each into the final design for the corridor. The implementation of one mode should not preclude the future implementation of any other mode. The integration of modes must be seamless and fully integrated with the remainder of the statewide system.

We continue to encourage CDOT to consider the benefits of increased utilization of these other alternative modes and routes to provide additional economic benefits off of the I-70 corridor such as other east-west alternatives like State Highway 40 and 50, and our rail and air components. The various alternatives that were evaluated during the PEIS process - even those deemed not to be the current best option - should be retained and incorporated in the findings and future statewide and I-70 planning efforts.

Club 20 recognizes that I-70 is the primary transportation economic lifeline for much of the western Colorado community, and the ability of this corridor to move both goods and people east and west across Colorado is critical to so many of western Colorado's diverse industries and communities. Recognizing the critical role that I-70 plays in defining the western Colorado economy, it is important to remember the areas outside of the defined study area so that an integrated statewide system can be created. Club 20 believes that critical connections to the corridor study area are to Denver International Airport, the Eagle Valley Airport and ultimately to Grand Junction. Movements north and south are equally important.

Club 20 believes a balance must be maintained between the economic needs of communities while remaining sensitive to environmental values. Protecting the environment along the corridor is essential. Efforts should be made to minimize the adverse impacts of the preferred alternative(s) employed in the corridor and any such impacts must be appropriately mitigated. CDOT should continue to use the best available data to make decisions based on sound science.

The scenic and natural beauty along the corridor needs to be maintained. Innovative designs and engineering should be employed to showcase this amazing corridor. Tourism is an important aspect of western Colorado's economy and we need to maintain this, as well as, the overall quality of life in western Colorado. The I-70 corridor is the primary connection for both visitors and residents in western Colorado.

Club 20 recognizes the study period of 25 years, but also understands that this timeframe is probably too short given the magnitude of the preferred alternative(s). Club 20 would encourage a longer perspective and a continuous planning and demand modeling process to prevent the design from becoming obsolete before it is even implemented.

Recognizing the financial constraints within which we must operate, the alternatives employed along the I-70 mountain corridor must be implemented incrementally with areas of greatest need addressed first. Transportation Demand Management and ITS elements should be deployed in the short-term to realize benefits with the existing infrastructure. The incremental approach must be purposeful and not hinder future implementation of alternatives.

Continued public involvement and participation in the process will be critical to the overall long-term success of the preferred alternative(s).

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the I-70 PEIS, and for your consideration of these comments. We look forward to continuing to work with CDOT in the future development of the I-70 mountain corridor.

Sincerely,

Reeves Brown  
Executive Director

Categorized Comment	767	Bruns, Sandra	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>We must find a permanent solution that does not use more and more fossil fuel injuring our environment. Build more lanes and they will come... Use mass transit and they will only come if they can live without a car. We have great public transportation in the Summit!</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	775	Bruns, William	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>William Bruns, 320 N 6th Ave, Frisco, CO - WCBruns714@msn.com</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	340	Bryan, Edie	Public	2/16/2005	<p>I would like to suggest that this study needs to be on the horizon of 50 years or at least 30 instead of just going 20 years to the year 2025. By having that shorter time frame, you eliminate alternatives that may cost more initially but would actually be of greater benefit or might be of greater benefit over the longer term.</p> <p>This is a major Colorado transportation corridor and has been for hundreds of years and will be in the future; it's not going to go away. It will still be here in 20 years. It will still be here in 50 years. The depreciation for such items as rail is 50 years. Therefore, if you only study 20, you haven't even done half the depreciation of the rails alone, much less anything else. This skews your results and invalidates your comparisons between various modes.</p> <p>So unless that is changed, I would ask that they only do the no action -- no bill or the minimal action, which is making the safety improvements and minor modifications to interchanges where there are problems.</p> <p>Also, in the short term, it would be cheapest to just add a few buses during those times when I-70 is most congested, which is on weekends, Saturday morning and Sunday evenings.</p> <p>I suggested this to one CDOT employee, and he said, Well, CDOT doesn't operate bus systems. That's perfectly true, but they can contract with those agencies, whether governmental or private, that do.</p> <p>And it is possible for the State Department of Transportation, not the Highway Department, to provide some subsidy, if necessary, for that. And it's a lot cheaper than adding two full lanes onto the side of I-70 for 150 miles.</p> <p>There appears, from my observation when I drive in the mountains, that there's plenty of room for additional bus service. I don't see too many buses. And whether they're coming from Nebraska or whether they're coming from the metro area, they would reduce the number of vehicles on the highway by a large number. They could be started very quickly and with a modest cost without major capital construction and could alleviate some of the bottleneck problems.</p> <p>I think that's all for now.</p>	Transcripts

Categorized Comment	212	Bryan, Edie	Public	2/16/2005	<p>1. No toll roads - they are a subsidy for the rich - and therefore violate Environmental Justice requirements. Benefits of a project must benefit those of low income as well as the McMansion group of people.</p> <p>2. Use longer planning horizon. How can you use 30 year bonds like Fastracks does if you only plan for 20 years. This corridor will still be a major corridor in 100 years. Using 20 years skews results. For example, rails are depreciated over 50 years. Please use 50 year horizon for these major plans.</p> <p>3. Using a longer planning time permits a better comparison of modes. Some transit options might have higher capital cost but perform better long term. You have unfairly rejected those alternatives without any knowledge of long-term comparisons.</p> <p>4. Short-term - add more ski trains. Contract for bus service at peak times. Subsidize these if it is cheaper than adding 4 more lanes.</p> <p>5. Give incentives to time required for bus, bus guideway, AGS, etc. so that it is faster and more convenient than single occupant vehicle stuck in traffic.</p> <p>6. Add additional parking at convenient locations for car pools. Advertise them.</p> <p>7. I prefer no build or no build with minimal action. This could improve existing traffic problems until a longer range plan is prepared which does not destroy the beauty, scenery, recreation, historic, and interest of Colorado mountains.</p> <p>8. Please use "context sensitive design" CSD for all portions of this 150 mile route. Use local committees to develop and design them.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	716	Buckalew, Don	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>No action (but continue \$532 million in already planned improvements)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	169	Buckland, Sally	Public	1/15/2005	<p>Thank you. My name is Sally Guanella Buckland. My address is 12557 Highway 40, Empire, Colorado 80438. I'm the fifth generation of our family to live in Clear Creek County.</p> <p>Guanella Pass, south of Georgetown, was named after my dad, Byron Guanella. He was county road supervisor and county commissioner. He helped plan and construct the road over Guanella Pass in the early 1950s. My family has lived in the county since 1860, and we have experienced lots of road and highway changes and widenings because our ranch west of Empire is divided down the middle by Highway 40.</p> <p>I-70 has such a huge impact on Clear Creek County as it runs the length of our county from the east side of Floyd Hill to the Eisenhower Tunnel and the Continental Divide. This section of I-70 corridor is very narrow and fragile and cannot accommodate just highway widening. We need to support the monorail and limited highway widening.</p> <p>If the highway is just widened, it will kill our county economically. Over the construction period, water quality will be threatened with mine and mill site disturbances as well as taking more of our very limited private property and destroying historic sites.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	155	Buckman, Charles	Public	2/2/2005	<p>I object to the AGS alternative being eliminated due to cost; this is very short sighted on the part of the CDOT. Please look at the success of the light rail in Denver to the Mineral Station. As soon as it was completed, people flocked to it and parking became an issue. Likewise, AGS looks to be expensive, but it is quiet, fast, and will have minimal impact on the I-70 corridor. We have property in Silverthorne overlooking I-70 and additional traffic noise is unacceptable. Thanks.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	426	Bujaryn, Walt	Public	4/1/2005	<p>I recently attended a presentation on the I-70 corridor at the Eagle County courthouse. The presentation was thorough and very well done. Attendance, unfortunately, was poor, but this is not the fault of the meeting planners. There was plenty of notice given about the meeting in the local press.</p> <p>A major element, however, is missing from this discussion. Emerging Lighter Than Air (LTA) technology in the form of airships could hold many answers for the I-70 corridor. In fact, this highly advanced technology meets or exceeds virtually every guideline for a possible I-70 solution to be considered by CDOT, and it isn't even mentioned. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--A fleet of 20 airships with a capacity of 80-150 passengers each would cost a fraction of the price of a monorail. A fleet of 40 would still cost a fraction. Based upon estimates I have gleaned from World Sky Cat, a fleet of 20 passenger airships would cost about \$560 million.</li> <li>--With take off and land anywhere (VTOL) capabilities the fleet would not be confined to the I-70 corridor, but would cover the entire Western Slope. Compare this to the limited range of a hugely expensive monorail.</li> <li>--Since the ships travel in the air they require almost no infrastructure, and minimal construction. The Town of Vail, for instance, could retrofit its transportation center and develop air service to the center of Vail Village, as could every other town on the Western Slope. Airships can land in an empty field if necessary. Again, compare these construction needs with those of the monorail.</li> <li>--The airships are highly fuel efficient and virtually non-polluting, and travel at speeds of 80-100 miles per hour.</li> <li>--The ride would be breathtaking and undoubtedly highly attractive to the travelling public. Airship travel is extremely comfortable and safe.</li> <li>--It would be reasonable to anticipate that passenger traffic among all the resorts and towns of the Western Slope would increase dramatically with strong airship service, thus providing an economic boom to the region.</li> <li>--There is the good possibility of strong corporate support in the forms of advertising and sponsorship. In other words, the venture could even be profitable with no cost to the State.</li> <li>--Regional taxing districts could be broadly established as one way of offsetting costs.</li> <li>--Heavy lift airships can be used to haul large amounts of freight, thus providing a real alternative to increased truck traffic on I-70. There are many possibilities in this scenario alone.</li> <li>--Airships have potential use in logging and firefighting, and could be enlisted in removing dead trees from our high-value forests.</li> <li>--Airships require relatively little maintenance and have very reasonable per-hour operating costs.</li> <li>--Problems with high winds and high altitude flight are apparently addressable. Airships have already flown millions of passenger miles, including many trans-Atlantic flights. All forms of transportation have their weaknesses.</li> <li>--The military is showing strong interest in LTA flight. Their positive assessments should be carefully considered by the civilian sector, without whose support the project will never get off the ground.</li> <li>--Airship design has advanced greatly with modern technology and aeronautical engineering, and the technology is highly deserving of a close look. Modern airships are streamlined and don't necessarily resemble the dirigibles of the 1940's.</li> <li>--It's the easiest sell in the world. Once people see the possibility of LTA flight they just go nuts over it.</li> </ul> <p>There is no place to put more cars or trucks in the mountains. Part of the plan for I-70 must be to GET THE TRAFFIC OFF OF THE ROAD AND INTO THE SKY. Don't tell me how to put 40 or 100 or 1000 more trucks onto the road; tell me how to get them off of the road. The only place to put them is into the sky, and if you're willing to stop and take a look it might just be possible.</p> <p>See <a href="http://www.atg-airships.com">www.atg-airships.com</a> (Advanced Technologies Group) and <a href="http://www.millenniumairship.com">www.millenniumairship.com</a> (Millennium Airship Inc.) for two examples of airship builders.</p> <p>Contact me at <a href="mailto:walt@fusemail.com">walt@fusemail.com</a> for a PDF article on airships entitled "Conquering the Oceans of the Sky".</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	663	Town of Grand Lake	Municipalities	4/26/2005	<p>Town of Grand Lake P.O. Box 6 Grand Lake, Colorado 80447-0006</p> <p>April 26, 2005</p> <p>Cecilia Joy, Project Manager CDOT, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>RE: I-70 Draft PEIS</p> <p>Ms. Joy,</p>	Written

Representatives from the Town of Grand Lake have attended several of the I-70 PEIS presentations and have hosted one, in order to better educate ourselves and our citizenry on the proposed project. After much consideration, we would like to officially offer the following comments:

1. If the alternative chosen is constructing more lanes, we believe that there should be three lanes on each side.
2. The presentation highlighted that when the improvements have been completed, the estimated increased traffic will need to be addressed again, effectively beginning this process over. Therefore, we believe that all of the right-of-way that will be necessary in 25 years should be obtained immediately; if CDOT knows its future needs, those concerns should be addressed now to make it easier for the adjoining property owners to plan for the future.
3. We realize that the additional bore through Moffat Tunnel for rail transit was discarded, but believe that it should be re-evaluated before a final decision is made.

Thank you for taking the time to consider our comments. We appreciate the opportunity to have input in this matter and look forward to working with the Colorado Department of Transportation in the future.

Sincerely,  
Judy M. Burke  
Mayor

PH 970/627-3435  
FAX 970/627-9290  
E-MAIL town@townofgrandlake.com

Categorized Comment	488	Burke, M	Public	5/12/2005	I would like to encourage the commission to investigate all mass transit alternatives for the corridor. I do not support widening the paved corridor.	Online
Categorized Comment	70	Burnham, Robert	Public	1/12/2005	The AGS alternative may be more expensive in the building period but I believe that the AGS would have the greatest benefit. What would need to change to make it the selected plan?  The future of transportation will be mass transit as more people move to the area. We should move in this direction.	Form
Categorized Comment	12	Burrows, R.	Public	12/19/2004	I am very opposed to 6 laneing I70, at least at this time. A rail system of some type is much preferable even though some systems cost more. I would not object to a monorail even if it meant higher taxes, assuming that is the consensus system. A rail system may be all that is needed as it can be expanded upon demand. With no rail system I can see where 6 lanes could end up with even 8 lanes in this highway controlled state.	Online
Categorized Comment	336	Burton, Vicky	Public	3/16/2005	Unfortunately I was unable to download the draft PEIS, but I did review the proposed alternate routes. I am a resident of Winter Park & generally avoid travel to Denver due to the increasing traffic on I-70. I recognize that it is an issue which needs to be addressed. Obviously I am opposed to any redirection of traffic through Grand County, as I feel it would significantly change its current rural appeal. I recognize that this would also be an issue for any of the other proposed areas. I have heard prior proposals for a train connection through the I-70 corridor & wonder if an elevated railway would be possible above the existing interstate, which would terminate at DIA, but service all of the major tourist destinations along the corridor. I think it is in our state's interest (environmentally & subsequently economically) to reduce highway traffic as much as possible. I believe that its use should not be exclusive to tourists. I recognize that in order for this to be effectively used, it would require a fairly frequent schedule (if possible hourly for major destinations) This may be an opportune time, with increasing gas prices & congestion, to step up to something different.	Online
Categorized Comment	521	Bustamante, Robert	Public	5/20/2005	Robert Bustamante May 20, 2005  States of arguments on I-70 Mountain Corridor.  I-70 Mountain Corridor needs to be expanded, by widening the highway and adding AGS. They need to expand I-70 Mountain Corridor because on weekends the highway is backed up, and over the years more and more people are going to travel through I-70. However, according to people that live near the expansion, the noise is going to get worse when they expand, and during the expansion, people that have business near I-70 corridor would lose business. This is why I think the AGS, and widening the highway should be the best option. Expanding I-70 corridor with the AGS system. The AGS system would be faster and comfortable than a car or a train, and you would not have to wait for the traffic if you travel by a car. However, the adding on to I-70 would bring more noise to the towns and communities. That is some negative and positive things on expanding I-70 Mountain Corridor. Here are some negative and positive things about the AGS system. AGS does not leave behind pollution like cars, trucks, buses, or trains would leave. That is because AGS does not run on fuel. AGS is quieter than any other transportation through I-70 Mountain Corridor. The AGS system does not use up road space, so people do not have to worry about the I-70 getting more crowded. Those are some negative and positive supports about the AGS System. Here are some negative and positive states concerning on widening the highway on I-70 Mountain Corridor. The machines used to expand the highway would leave us with bad air pollution. That is because the machines run on fuel. Widening the highway would mean that they would have to the sizes of small towns throughout the I-70 Mountain Corridor. They are going to do that so they have enough room to expand the highway. Widening the highway would not bring as much tourist through the towns, so small business owners throughout the small towns along the I-70 Mountain Corridor would lose business and money. That is some negative things about widening the highway. Expanding I-70 Mountain Corridor brings many arguments, that is why they should only build the AGS System. Building the AGS system is positive, because it does not take much space, and it does not leave behind bad air pollution. They should not build a train or bus system, because the travel time is long, and they would not make it up the steep hills along the mountain. Those are some arguments about expanding I-70 Mountain Corridor. That is why I think I-70 needs to be expanded by adding the AGS System. Please make a very good design on expanding I-70 Mountain Corridor.	Online
Categorized Comment	247	Butler, Lynne	Public	3/1/2005	More lanes added to I-70 IS not the answer! First of all, I'm a commuter, using the interstate to drive from Idaho Springs (Exit #238) to Denver several times each week. The only time there is a congestion problem is on Sunday afternoon/evening going east or when there has been an accident. Friday afternoons traveling west is heavy, but traffic still flows well. More lanes will only cause pollution, add intolerable noise for residents in small communities next to the interstate and potentially destroy historical and cultural properties. Tourism in Clear Creek County would suffer severely during the lengthy construction time for additional lanes to be completed. If sound walls were built, you wouldn't be able to view the lovely historic towns along the interstate.  If we want to address highway congestion where it's a problem, let's look at Denver (metro) and I-25!! Where are the slow-down areas in our state?!	Form
Categorized Comment	123	Caldwell, Rick	Public	1/12/2005	Thank you. My name is Rick Caldwell, and I'm an interested citizen of Silver Plume. And I'm going to discuss a fairly narrow but I think a fairly important issue of particular concern to Silver Plume. To a lesser extent, I think it's true for all of the counties all over the place between the twin tunnels and Eisenhower, and that is environmental justice.  And I'm here to question the finding in the PEIS that there is no environmental justice issue in this proposal. I think there is, at least with regard to Silver Plume. It is one of the most, if not the most, impacted area in the whole corridor, due to noise and air pollution, visual pollution.  I understand that there's no intent at this point to take -- to take homes, but along Madison Street and Water Street, there are a line of homes that it's very hard to believe will survive the highway-widening alternative. And I think they'll be taken. And they are occupied by low-income people. That in and of itself is an environmental justice issue.  In addition to being heavily and adversely impacted, Silver Plume has the highest incidence of poverty in the entire corridor. Using the figures that you have in the PEIS, which are based on census 2000 Silver Plume town figures, 27 percent of the town is low-income. If you use the 2000 census figures that's based on the zip code, that goes up to 37 percent.  And, in fact, in a more recent survey done this year in the town with regard to a different project, a water line project, revealed a 54 percent poverty -- over half of the people made less than 24,000 per year. So you have the most heavily impacted area in the whole corridor, which is also the poorest area in the whole corridor, and it just doesn't seem right to say that there is no disproportionately high impact upon	Transcripts

low-income people.

Looking at the other side of the equation, there's two sets of beneficiaries. There are the people and the businesses in Eagle and Summit Counties who stand to profit nicely from this, in many cases are already better off than the people of Silver Plume. And there are those who will be traveling the highway if it's expanded. Both I submit, are much better off than the people of Silver Plume, although I can't tell you by how much because the PEIS doesn't include any number for that.

It's too late to deal with this in Tier II. It has to be dealt with now because the choices are being made at this point. Once we get to Tier II, they've already decided to widen the highway and the harm's already done.

Thank you very much. I see my time's done.

Categorized Comment	463	Caldwell, Rick	Public	4/11/2005	<p>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND THE TOWN OF SILVER PLUME IN THE I-70 MOUNTAIN CORRIDOR</p> <p>Mailed by Rick Caldwell, Silver Plume Resident (caldwell970@aol.com, 303-569-0374). To CDOT, copy to EPA, on April 11, 2005</p> <p>Introduction. Executive Order 12898 and its progeny require all US federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects (including social and economic effects) of their policies, programs and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. This requirement is known as Environmental Justice (EJ).</p> <p>EJ applies to the proposed expansion of Interstate 70 west of Denver. That Project is the subject of a draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) released by the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) in December, 2004. The PEIS purports to examine the issue EJ and concludes that it is not implicated in the proposed expansion.</p> <p>This comment challenges that conclusion as it applies to Silver Plume, the most westerly municipality in Clear Creek County. While the focus is on Silver Plume, most of the arguments apply with nearly equal force to the entire County west of Floyd Hill, where virtually all the proposed highway widening will occur.</p> <p>Summary of Argument. Silver Plume has the highest incidence of poverty in the entire project corridor. Highway widening is associated with a variety of adverse impacts of the sort required to be included in EJ analysis. Virtually all of those adverse impacts will be in Clear Creek County, and they will be at their worst in Silver Plume.</p> <p>Meanwhile, those who stand to benefit from the project are far better off economically than those who will pay the greatest price for the project. The PEIS fails to address this project-wide disproportionate impact. It also fails to address such disproportionate impact at the local level, where both negative impacts and incidence of poverty are often a function of distance from the highway.</p> <p>Finally, postponing proper EJ analysis until Tier 2 will be too late because the transit alternatives most likely to address the problem will already have been eliminated. EJ analysis in the PEIS is fatally flawed and must be redone now, taking into account the true costs of highway widening and applying the proper approach, before proceeding to Tier 2.</p> <p>Silver Plume has the highest incidence of poverty in the entire corridor. CDOT divided the entire corridor into five counties and 25 sub-county localities for analysis. Population, poverty, and other demographic data for each county and locality are shown in Table 3.11-7 (on page 3.11-6) of the PEIS. The data are based on 2000 Census figures.</p> <p>The line for Silver Plume shows that 27% of its households are low-income. This means that 27% of the households in Silver Plume made less than half of the median household income for Clear Creek County as a whole. The county median was \$50,997, half of which was \$25,498.50. The Silver Plume median of \$35,208 was questionable then and is even more so now.</p> <p>In 2004, the Town Board conducted a survey of all households in Silver Plume in order to qualify for better financing terms on a new water system to be partially funded by the Colorado Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) and the Federal Department of Agriculture (FDA). FDA uses the same CDBS-based definition of poverty as was used by CDOT in the PEIS. For purposes of the survey, DOLA estimated that the county median household income had dropped to \$48,000, half of which is \$24,000. The results of the survey have now been accepted by DOLA and FDA. They reveal that 54% of the households in Silver Plume earned less than \$24,000.</p> <p>In short, more recent information shows that 54% of the households in Silver Plume are in fact low-income. Even CDOT's own figure of 27%, however, is exceptionally high—and higher than that of any other locality shown in Table 3.11-7.</p> <p>Highway widening is associated with a variety of adverse impacts of the sort required to be included in Environmental Justice analysis. Especially in a narrow and inhabited mountain valley like ours, substantially increased pavement and traffic can be expected to have many negative impacts, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• additional air pollution from vehicle emissions;</li> <li>• additional noise pollution from motors, brakes, horns, etc.;</li> <li>• loss of sunlight to some adjacent homes and businesses;</li> <li>• visual blight (especially if sound barriers are used);</li> <li>• impairment of historic structures and districts (which are particularly numerous and vulnerable in Silver Plume and Clear Creek County);</li> <li>• chemical runoff into yards and streams;</li> <li>• additional exposure to falling rock;</li> <li>• additional barriers to wildlife movement;</li> <li>• loss of access during construction (critical to Silver Plume residents, whose only eastbound access is I-70);</li> <li>• loss of the pedestrian/bicycle trail from Silver Plume to Georgetown;</li> <li>• displacement of homes and business for additional right-of-way.</li> </ul> <p>The PEIS attempts to downplay most of these potential adverse effects, but numerous submissions by other concerned citizens and corridor governments provide substantial detail on and support for the view that many of them are quite significant in this project.</p> <p>Virtually all of the adverse effects of the proposed highway widening will be in Clear Creek County. There are at least two reasons for this. First, 90% of the proposed highway widening in the entire corridor is to occur in Clear Creek County between its western boundary at the Eisenhower tunnels and Floyd Hill on the east. East of Floyd Hill the highway is already six lanes wide. (Significantly, the portion of the county from Floyd Hill east—the portion that will not be affected by highway widening—is also the area with the highest income in the County—the household median is \$70,300 according to CDOT's own Table 3.11-7. Factor out Floyd Hill and Clear Creek surely becomes the poorest county in the corridor.)</p> <p>Second, Clear Creek has more existing development up against the existing highway than do other parts of the corridor. The impacts of highway-generated air pollution, noise pollution, loss of sunlight, visual blight, impairment of historic structures and districts, and other adverse effects of widening the highway and significantly increasing the amount of traffic on it are all exacerbated by proximity to the offending highway. Generally speaking, the closer you are to the highway, the worse the adverse impacts. And the highway between Floyd Hill and Eisenhower is situated in a particularly narrow valley with a substantial percentage of the population located close to the highway.</p> <p>Despite extensive review of census statistics, consultation with the State Demography Office, and other efforts, we have not been able to locate any data relating the incidence of poverty to distance from the highway. Nor does the PEIS contain such data (though it should). But a windshield survey clearly reveals that much of the poorest housing in the County and Silver Plume—presumably containing some of the poorest households—is located nearest the highway. As is so often the case, the poor suffer most.</p> <p>These adverse impacts are at their worst in Silver Plume, where the sounds of braking trucks are at their loudest, the loss of access during construction is greatest, the valley is at its narrowest, and the poorest dwellings are closest to the highway.</p> <p>Though the PEIS says the highway will be widened without any displacement of residents, it is hard to believe that this is possible in Silver Plume. Here's why:</p> <p>Houses along the south side of Water and Madison Streets back right up to the north edge of the highway right-of-way already. Cliffs and the station facilities of the state-owned Georgetown Loop Railway preclude expansion along the south of the existing highway. Addition of two or more lanes along the north, whether they are supported by retaining walls as suggested on Page L-30 of the PEIS (Vol. 2) or cantilevered as informally stated by CDOT, will hover over those houses like the sword of Damocles. They will block sunlight, spew pollutants, and create a din far worse than at present. Even if a house remains literally unharmed, it will become virtually uninhabitable. Under Colorado law, CRS 38-1-114(c), where only part of a parcel is taken through eminent domain, the condemning authority must also pay for any damages to the remainder of the parcel. Owners of the uninhabitable houses may well insist that the state take—and compensate them for—the entire parcel. And the state may welcome the invitation to do just that. After all, cantilevering or retaining walls could well cost more than just acquiring and destroying the entire row of houses—and displacing the predominantly low-income people that</p>	Written
---------------------	-----	----------------	--------	-----------	--	---------

occupy them.

Given the shortage of affordable housing that already exists in Clear Creek County, loss of their present homes may be irredeemable for those low-income people, however much cash compensation they are given. For those who have long made their lives in Silver Plume, the displacement will be particularly wrenching.

Beneficiaries of the project are far better off economically than those who will pay the greatest price for the project. Two classes of people will benefit from the project, which is proposed primarily to relieve peak recreation traffic on weekends. The first class contains the owners and operators of ski areas and other recreational businesses on the west slope, mostly in Summit and Eagle counties. The PEIS contains no demographic data on this group of beneficiaries (though it should), and we are aware of none. But surely this is a group with average wealth and income far in excess of Clear Creek County in general and Silver Plume in particular.

The second class consists of travelers on the improved transportation corridor. At non-peak travel times, they might be expected to have fairly average demographics, but it is not such times that the project aims at. The project is aimed at facilitating the flow of recreational traffic from and back to the Denver Metro Area on weekends—especially during ski season in the winter. Given the cost of skiing or many of the other forms of recreation involved, this group of travelers can also be expected to have above average income.

The PEIS fails to address Environmental Justice adequately at either the local level or the project-wide level. CDOT's approach to the EJ issue is to view the corridor as a string of different localities. Each of those localities may incur adverse impacts which differ in kind or degree from other localities, but within any particular locality—Silver Plume, for example—the impacts are essentially uniform within the community. Thus the adverse impacts on low-income populations within Silver Plume are the same as they are on non-low-income populations in Silver Plume. The PEIS asserts that there is no disproportionate impact, therefore no EJ problem.

There are two problems with this approach. First, it is inadequate even on its own terms. As argued earlier, negative impacts and the incidence of poverty are often a function of distance from the highway. Based on personal knowledge, we believe it highly likely that there is a larger proportion of low-income households near the highway in Silver Plume (and indeed through most of Clear Creek County) than further away from the highway. We lack the hard data to test this assertion, but a proper analysis by CDOT would have included such data. In short, the PEIS should have included and analyzed data on both impacts and poverty as a function of distance from the highway within each of the relevant localities.

Second, focusing exclusively on EJ at the local level ignores the big picture. Viewed as a whole, the project clearly displays a clustering of adverse impacts in the poorest county (Clear Creek) and especially the poorest locality (Silver Plume) in the entire corridor—all for the benefit of significantly better off populations elsewhere within or even outside the corridor. Surely this is precisely the kind of disproportionate impact that EJ analysis is designed to address.

Postponing proper EJ analysis until Tier 2 will be too late because the alternative most likely to address the problem will already have been eliminated. Concerned Silver Plume officials have made numerous attempts, going back many months, to raise their EJ concerns with CDOT. On November 10, 2004, for example, Cassandra Shenk, a Town Trustee, wrote to Cecilia Joy, the CDOT Project Manager, requesting a meeting on the subject. Her response was that any such meeting should await completion of the draft PEIS. Renewed efforts since the draft PEIS was completed have been equally unavailing.

CDOT now asserts that all our concerns can be adequately mitigated in Tier 2. We strongly disagree. Proper EJ analysis is supposed to occur as early as possible in the process of scoping a project and narrowing the alternatives. If CDOT is unwilling or unable to do it right in Tier 1 (the PEIS), the chances of them doing it right later on are slight.

More importantly, what are probably the most attractive alternatives to highway widening—rail and, especially, advanced guideway systems (AGS), are on the verge of being eliminated from further consideration. Companion papers will argue the multiple advantages of AGS over any of the highway alternatives which CDOT currently favors. Suffice it to say here that virtually all of the disproportionately high and adverse effects referenced above go away with an AGS approach. But by Tier 2, AGS will no longer be on the table.

This project is a textbook study of how performing or dodging a proper EJ analysis can directly affect the choices made at the Tier 1 stage of analysis. It is unfortunate (especially for those of us who are Colorado taxpayers) that CDOT has spent so much time and money on such an inadequate PEIS. But they have, and there is no legal or moral choice now but to go back and do it right before proceeding to the next step.

Categorized Comment	465	Calhoun, John	Public	4/3/2005	<p>TO: Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>FROM: John Calhoun PO Box 982 Silver Plume, Colo. 80476</p> <p>SUBJECT: Comment on I-70 PEIS</p> <p>Prelatory Note: Portions of this comment may appear in a summary comment submitted by the Town of Silver Plume, which I serve as a member of the Board of Trustees. I am submitting the comment here to assure that it will be considered in full. The reference in the first paragraph below to "crystal ball gazing" is to language employed by Harry Dale and others at a Coalition presentation in Silver Plume Large Town Hall, 28 March 2005.</p> <p>It is essential to keep in mind that the entire I-70 PEIS is an exercise in constructing hypotheses based on specific, limited sets of data—"crystal ball gazing," to adopt the pejorative language applied to suggestions that the PEIS use wider and different data sets. The existing PEIS confines its speculation to hypotheses based on current costs, and excludes from consideration a number of other obvious and relevant costs, presumably on the grounds that such other costs are difficult to quantify and not usually considered in transportation impact statements.</p> <p>This comment asks CDOT to include in the final version of the PEIS amended cost and feasibility estimates that take into account several additional factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any I-70 alternative that relies on automobiles as the actual transportation vehicle should include reliable estimates of the cost of petroleum for at least the period from 2005 through 2025, and more responsibly through 2065, the last year for which the PEIS offers predictions in Table B-6 on page B-89, "Accommodating Future Travel Growth...." Those costs should relate not only to the costs for asphalt, but also to the costs for gas and oil for the cars.</li> <li>2. Predicted petroleum costs should take into account the imminent dwindling of world petroleum production. The following excerpts from two columns published in the NY Times on March 25, 2005, in response to congressional action to permit drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, define the issue. I have added emphasis to certain phrases:</li> </ol> <p>THE greatest year of United States [petroleum] production was 1970. Prudhoe Bay started producing oil in 1977, but never enough to raise American production above the level of 1970. The Arctic refuge will probably have an even smaller effect. Every little bit helps, but even the most successful drilling project at the Arctic refuge would be only a little bit...</p> <p>In 1997 and 1998 a few petroleum geologists began examining world oil production using the methods that M. King Hubbert used in predicting in 1956 that United States oil production would peak during the early 1970's. These geologists indicated that world oil output would reach its apex in this decade—some 30 to 40 years after the peak in American oil production. Almost no one paid attention.... I used to work with Mr. Hubbert at Shell Oil, and my own independent research places the peak of world oil production late this year or early in 2006....</p> <p>WHEN it comes to energy, we are trapped between a rock and several hard places. The world's soaring demand for oil is pushing against the limits of production, lifting the price of crude nearly 90 percent in the last 18 months. Congress's vote in favor of drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge won't make much difference because the amount of oil there, at best, is tiny relative to global or even American needs. And relief isn't likely to come anytime soon from drilling elsewhere: oil companies spent \$8 billion on exploration in 2003, but discovered only \$4 billion of commercially useful oil.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. In addition to dwindling world production, predicted petroleum costs should take into account the significant impact of vastly increased demand from developing countries, especially China and India.</li> <li>4. Our nation's dependence on Middle East oil inevitably incurs costs that are not reflected in the price of a barrel of oil. For purposes of revisions to the PEIS, predicted petroleum costs should include some supportable estimate of the percentage attributable to our dependence on Middle East oil of the economic and human costs of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• war in Iraq,</li> <li>• terrorism and homeland security,</li> <li>• balance of trade deficits,</li> <li>• national budgetary deficits and attendant international borrowing.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	Written

- domestic political divisions, and
- international diplomatic and trade conflicts and uncertainties.

Such costs presumably have never in the past been factored into CDOT transportation decisions. This comment asserts that failing to do so is historically irresponsible and contrary to the best interests of the people of the United States.

5. The PEIS—and Ms. Joy herself—allude informally to the potential for hydrogen fuel cells to replace petroleum as the energy source to run cars. This comment suggests that the PEIS should address that potential explicitly, in the light of the following quotation, also from a NY Times article published on March 25, 2005:

How about hydrogen? To replace just America's surface transportation with cars and trucks running on fuel cells powered by hydrogen, America would have to produce 230,000 tons of the gas—or enough to fill 13,000 Hindenburg dirigibles—every day [emphasis added]. This could be generated by electrolyzing water, but to do so America would have to nearly double its electricity output, and generating this extra power with carbon-free renewable energy would mean covering an area the size of Massachusetts with solar panels or of New York State with windmills.

In addition, the PEIS should note and perhaps emphasize that in the arid west, and in Colorado in particular, water is the last thing we can afford to burn in our cars.

6. The thrust of this comment thus far will suggest that the author has a not-so-hidden agenda, comprised of two parts that the PEIS should also address:

a.) The author is intuitively certain that if predicted petroleum costs are factored in as suggested by this comment, any I-70 alternative dependent on the future use of cars will be found to be untenable.

b.) It is therefore incumbent on the author to propose an alternative that might prove tenable, viable and forward looking, to wit:

If a form of Advanced Guideway System (AGS), powered by electricity, were coupled with the type of power plant called an "integrated gasification combined-cycle facility" (a technology that exists today), Colorado could provide the nation and perhaps the world with a transportation model that is

- cost-effective,
- employs "clean" energy, and provides
- maximum safety,
- very high capacity,
- minimum construction impact,
- attractiveness to tourism,
- negligible impact on the infrastructure of Rural Resort Region towns,
- negligible impact on their environment and their history, and
- independence from foreign, dwindling, and vulnerable petroleum sources.

To complete this comment, the following discussion of gasification is provided, again from the March 25, 2005 issue of the NY Times. Portions of the excerpt have been emphasized to point out their relevance to financing the I-70 project and to resources available to Colorado:

Here's how it works: in a type of power plant called an integrated gasification combined-cycle facility, we change any fossil fuel, including coal, into a superhot gas that is rich in hydrogen and in the process strip out pollutants like sulfur and mercury. As in a traditional combustion power plant, the heat generates large amounts of electricity; but in this case, the gas byproducts can be pure streams of hydrogen and carbon dioxide.

This matters for several reasons. The hydrogen produced could be used as a transportation fuel. Equally important, the harmful carbon dioxide waste is in a form that can be pumped deep underground and stored, theoretically for millions of years, in old oil and gas fields or saline aquifers. This process is called geologic storage, or carbon sequestration, and recent field demonstrations in Canada and Norway have shown it can work and work safely.

The marriage of gasified coal plants and geologic storage could allow us to build power plants that produce vast amounts of energy with virtually no carbon dioxide emissions in the air. The Department of Energy is pursuing plans to build such a zero-emission power plant and is encouraging energy companies to come up with proposals of their own. The United States, Britain and Germany are also collaborating to build such plants in China and India as part of an effort by the Group of 8. Moreover these plants are very flexible: although coal is the most obvious fuel source, they could burn almost any organic material, including waste cornhusks and woodchips.

This is an emerging technology, so inevitably there are hurdles. For example, we need a crash program of research to find out which geological formations best lock up the carbon dioxide for the longest time, followed by global geological surveys to locate these formations and determine their capacity. Also, coal mining is dangerous and strip-mining, of course, devastates the environment; if we are to mine a lot more coal in the future we will want more environmentally friendly methods.

On balance, though, this combination of technologies is probably among the best ways to provide the energy needed by modern societies—including populous, energy-hungry and coal-rich societies like China and India—without wrecking the global climate.

Fossil fuels, especially petroleum, powered the industrialization of today's rich countries and they still drive the world economy. But within the lifetimes of our grandchildren, the age of petroleum will wane. The combination of gasified coal plants and geologic storage can be our bridge to the clean energy—derived from renewable resources like solar and wind power and perhaps nuclear fusion—of the 22nd century and beyond.

c.c. Jean Wallace, P.E.  
Senior Operations Engineer  
Federal Highway Administration  
12300 West Dakota Avenue  
Lakewood, CO 80228

Categorized Comment	78	Calhoun, John	Public	1/21/2005	a failure of the draft PEIS	Online
					<p>The following comment is addressed to the failure of the I-70 PEIS to consider the implications of completing a highway paving project sometime between 2020 and 2025 (presumably) that even the engineers I consulted at a CDOT public meeting agree will result in the SAME CONGESTION AND DELAY WE EXPERIENCE TODAY, involving, however, more cars and people.</p> <p>I pointed out the paradoxical nature of this fact to the same engineers, asking how the PEIS resolves the paradox, and their response was to underline the hope that maybe some of the futuristic "traffic management" technologies cited (like computer controlled cars that will enable them to be stacked inches apart at high speeds on the highway) will "solve" the problem and resolve the paradox. Aside from the fact that if it can even be achieved such a stacking of cars would simply create a train without rails that wastes an incredible amount of energy, there is absolutely no evidence offered in the PEIS that those hypothetical technologies would be affordable or acceptable to actual travelers, even if they are actually created.</p> <p>The obvious way to resolve the paradox is to adopt today, IN LIEU OF PAVING, a mass transit system comparable to the proven mag-lev system outlined in the recently released study of same.</p> <p>However, the "we-cannot-afford-effective-rail-mass-transit-because-Tom-Norton-has-established-arbitrary-\$4-billion-ceiling" logic of the current CDOT I-70 effort strongly suggests that sometime around 2020 or 2025 we will once again be greeted with the same logic and an attempt once again to add two-to-four more lanes to the highway, a massive paving project that will include not just Clear Creek County, but also all the other counties in the corridor, with its attendant massive negative impacts for god knows how many decades while construction proceeds.</p> <p>In addition, the resulting 8-12 lane highway through Clear Creek County would virtually pave the entire Clear Creek valley that hosts I-70, and make considerable inroads on the apparent commitment of CDOT to pave substantial portions of the counties to the west. Presumably, at the end of that second massive paving project, once again the result would be EXACTLY THE SAME CONGESTION AND DELAY WE EXPERIENCE TODAY, involving many, many more cars and people.</p> <p>Eventually, CDOT's logic and approach to transportation would finally succeed in paving the entire I-70 corridor, wall to wall, creating a truly awesome parking lot.</p> <p>The insanity of that course AND MORE IMPORTANTLY THE INSANITY OF THAT LOGIC must either be disavowed definitively in the current PEIS or definitively embraced, with supporting research and argument. I am able to find neither of these options in the present draft and respectfully submit that the draft is therefore fatally flawed.</p> <p>John Calhoun Silver Plume, Colo. cmc-jtc@mindspring.com</p>	

Categorized Comment	172	Callison, Anne	Public	1/15/2005	<p>My name is Anne Callison. I live in Denver. And by way of disclosure, I am the principal and sole owner of Barber Communications, Inc. I've been very fortunate over the last several years to have as two of my clients the Colorado Intermountain Fixed Guideway Authority, and I was also the hired campaign coordinator for ballot question 1(a) in Clear Creek last fall.</p> <p>As I've worked in Clear Creek County over the last several years, I've come to know and like and respect many people in Clear Creek County. I also am an active I-70 user, and that's why I'm involved here today.</p> <p>I'd like to read to you from ES33: Although consideration of regional construction impacts is included in the REMI model study, localized project alternative, construction impacts are expected to be most prominent in Clear Creek County. Primary construction impacts on Clear Creek County would be localized to I-70 communities, and -- excuse me -- community residents, commuters, resident local travelers and retail businesses. However, because the bulk of the county's population is located along the eastern border of the county, these residents, commuters, and the personal income they generate are not expected to incur substantial impacts from I-70 construction.</p> <p>You know, we lost the ballot question 1(a) by 600 votes. I think had we started a little earlier, we would have won it, and this county would have a quarter of a million dollars with which to fight this PEIS. I'd have to believe that knowing these folks as I do, they're going to protect their county, they're going to protect these towns.</p> <p>And when they see what's written here, the only conclusion one can come away with from this is that you don't care about the people that live in the central and western portion of the county. And the eastern portion of the county has to worry because when the homes and the businesses get torn down and when the tourism, which is the number two income generator for Clear Creek County, goes away, it's the eastern portion of the county that's going to be taxed the most heavily to support the western and the central parts of Clear Creek County.</p> <p>You simply -- this document is deficient. You have to go back. Whether you use REMI or some other model, you've got to go back and look at the impacts of construction, even the threat of construction, in the 10 to 15 years you're proposing. You've got to go back and look at AGS as a standalone alternative, and you've got to go back and look at the freight implications of AGS. And, you know, the people of this county said it the other night, you've got to have the 21st-century vision.</p> <p>Lastly, I've noticed today when I look at the list of public hearings that are in the mountain communities, you're only allowing an hour and a half, from 5:30 to 7:00, for comment. That simply must be extended.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	127	Callison, Anne	Public	1/12/2005	<p>My name is Anne Callison. I'm an avid I-70 user who lives in Denver.</p> <p>I believe after the briefest review of this document, only because it was delivered to some of us just before the Christmas holiday, and I find that very unfortunate -- I believe this document is deficient in many areas on many levels, and I think it deserves to be withdrawn and supplements begun as quickly as possible.</p> <p>This document costs somewhere between 23 and 28 million dollars, taxpayer funds. I think that many counties in Colorado would like to have any portion of that money to repave highways or rebuild bridges, but instead, it was spent on this project.</p> <p>I think it's truly unfortunate that many alternatives were deleted from the process too early and without enough supporting documentation and with not enough consultation with interested parties.</p> <p>The monorail is one of those where you compare the cost of 165 miles of monorail with only 38 miles of highway construction. That, to me, makes this a deficient document.</p> <p>Tom Norton said this morning in a meeting when asked where the \$4 billion funding cap came for this, he said, "It came from me." I asked Mr. Norton, Write our congressional delegation and share with them specifically which pots of money would the Federal Trade Administration and the Federal Highway Administration, EPA, wherever the money's coming from, and from all the state sources and the local sources, and taxes of the people in this county and Summit and Eagle may be called upon to generate to pay for this project. Let's find out where that money is, and let's try to go find it. I ask that that be done.</p> <p>I think it's critically important that Clear Creek County be consulted as the supplement is prepared on an economic impact study that studies the impacts during construction, not using the REMI model, the R-E-M-I model, at the end of the 15 years of construction. That's just fallacious. I mean, that should not have been accepted by the legal citizen review.</p> <p>The peer review committee. I want to know why the peer review committee for the traffic demand model was dismissed.</p> <p>And this is my exhibit tonight. These are my two ski passes, my two annual ski passes. One of them is the Colorado Card for this year; one of them is for a resort in another state. I will tell you, I haven't even used my Colorado Card yet this year.</p> <p>It's too depressing. It raises my blood pressure too much to get on this highway. And I can assure you, and I want you to let Colorado Ski Country and Adam Merritt and Roger McCarthy and Intrawest know that if you announce that you are going to widen or harmonize this highway to the mountains where I and many others from Denver and Colorado go to recreate, I will not continue to buy a Colorado pass. I will stop skiing in Colorado. And I'll use this one, and I'll buy it again next and every year.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	239	Callison, Anne	Public	1/26/2005	<p>My name is Anne Callison. I'm from Denver. I drove up here tonight to bring up some points about the PEIS and the process that preceded it.</p> <p>Miller Hudson, the former executive director of CIFCA, and I did some research the other day in our boxes, and we found a letter dated February 20, 2001, in which it was pointed out that the rider surveys on which so much of this document, draft final document is based was flawed.</p> <p>Early on there had been discussions that there would be at least three sets of interviews, three surveys done both in the winter and in the summer. For whatever reason, only one survey was done in the winter and one in the summer. That, to me, says that this document, the traffic demand model is deficient.</p> <p>In addition, there's a visual preference survey. I, myself, many times at the MCAC/TAC spoke up and asked how it was going to be done. I spoke up in a private meeting at JF Sato and asked how it was going to be done, and lo and behold, they had a whopping 50 respondents to a visual preference survey. That, to me, again, points out that this document is deficient.</p> <p>I so appreciate the comments from the councilwoman. I would really encourage all the communities up here to talk to the Colorado tourism bureau, look at the next time the Longwood studies are going to be done, do your own studies.</p> <p>One county commissioner from Clear Creek very, very wisely pointed out that the PEIS is the beginning of the best "Ski Utah" promotion that will ever be done. I, myself, have the Colorado Card, and yes, you know, we haven't had any snow. I haven't skied in this state yet; it's January 2005.</p> <p>UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's just in Vail.</p> <p>ANNE CALLISON: No. It's not. My husband just ripped his ski to the core at Beaver Creek two weeks ago. So, thank you, no.</p> <p>You know, other questions. I truly want to know how the public, and particularly the interested parties, are going to be involved in writing that MOU on the mine waste. Don't, please, let this be an MOU written strictly between FHWA, CDOT, and CDPHE without any input. That will not set a good precedence.</p> <p>The bus and transit, I would ask before the next presentation, the photo that you all have been showing was taken in Australia. The only other bus in guideway system that has been built was in Germany. It was shut down after the first snowstorm. And, literally, men had to go out with handpicks to pick the ice out between the rails. That -- that alternative is such a nonstarter. Truly for having spent 23 to 28 million dollars on this study, that's an embarrassment to see in print.</p> <p>Lastly, I truly -- and not quite lastly -- I want to see the economic impact study, as Mr. Rapp pointed out, done for the 15 years of construction. It will not just affect Clear Creek County; it will affect all of metropolitan Denver, it will affect all of Summit, Eagle, and Route, and Lake, and Park, and Pitkin, and Grand, and Mesa, and go on and on. Because when we in Denver hear that there is going to be construction on I-70, many of us are not willing to get off and get on 8th. We're just not willing to do it.</p> <p>This was something that Tom Norton used at the MCAC/TAC last week. He says, You know, because of FasTracks -- or T-Rex -- we know how to move traffic off and around the interstate. Folks, there is nowhere to put them off I-70; it doesn't work that way. You dispensed with 285 as an alternative, but not everybody is going to take 285. 285 is still two lanes. So the T-Rex and the I-70 comparison simply does not hold water.</p>	Transcripts

Lastly, this morning I spent three hours in the Colorado Tolling Enterprise meeting, and what I came away with was that many elected and appointed representatives and staff members from Denver cities said, Do not think for a moment, CDOT, that you are going to allow toll facilities called the Denver System to be built such that it will generate enough funding to build other projects in this state. The people of Denver are not going to pay for this project.

So, again, I support Ed's call, and I've made it before. I want to know where the 1.6 billion's going to come from, much less the money it will take to build AGS. And, again, I go back to that study, and I encourage the counties and the towns and the ski resorts to study what's going to happen -- what they're going to lose, but what they would gain if we build AGS. We will truly become an international area; otherwise, I fear that the numbers here are going to be very poor in years to come.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	414	Callison, Anne	Public	2/26/2005	<p>My name is Anne Callison. I live in Denver. I used to be an active I-70 user. I don't use it as much anymore, for obvious reasons.</p> <p>I'm very disappointed in this Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, as you know, this draft, because I don't believe that this draft followed the three C's, the three planning principles under NEPA: That it be comprehensive, that it be cooperative, and that it be continuous.</p> <p>As to cooperativeness, I'd like to read something that came out of FHWA and FTA recently on NEPA. They say during the planning alternatives analysis all the reasonable alternatives under consideration must be fully evaluated in terms of their transportation impacts, capital and operating costs, social, economic, and environmental impacts, and technical consideration.</p> <p>I think, as you heard in the public statements made in this public hearing process, that that is not the case, that those of us who have reviewed this document find it lacking in many of those areas.</p> <p>It also says there must be appropriate public involvement in the planning alternatives analysis. I go back to the three C's: comprehensive, cooperative, and continuous. And let's look at what happened during the MCAC/TAC process. There were periods of over a year when the MCAC/TAC did not meet. That is neither continuous nor is it cooperative, and it certainly cannot be deemed comprehensive.</p> <p>As late as a couple of months ago when you all held your last MCAC/TAC, it was noticed that there would be a discussion there of changes in the purpose and need statement. I have yet -- today is February 26 -- to see a redline version of the old purpose and need and the new purpose and need statement. How on earth can that be considered comprehensive, cooperative, and continuous?</p> <p>I think you all have missed many of the steps in the EIS process, and I think it's high time that you bring back the local governments and the affected communities and the affected publics and you begin to discuss the elements that will be in the supplement to this PEIS.</p> <p>It says, The NEPA scoping participants must agree on the alternatives that will be considered in the NEPA review. Today I'm requesting so I don't have to FOIA you, I'd like to see the email and written documentation of all the NEPA scoping participants to alternatives and how they detailed which -- why a certain alternative should be kept in and why a certain alternative should be left off.</p> <p>I'd like to know when you're going to announce this supplement. And I really think it's time -- I know the corridor coalition are working on a regionally preferred alternative -- how is the corridor coalition going to be involved in planning the supplement? How is the public going to be involved in planning the supplement?</p> <p>As I stated the last time I spoke, I also would like to know how public hearings are going to be held between now and the new May deadline, because one of the reasons -- one of the greatest reasons that was requested for the extension was because of the bulk of this document. I still am not through the entire thing, and I would like to have another opportunity, on the record, to ask questions regarding the draft PEIS. So I would really like to know very soon in writing or by email, or if you'd like to announce it today, when there will be another series of public hearings for this PEIS.</p> <p>You know, I'll echo some of what Miller said. You know, there have been so many things that we have called out that went wrong in this process. You know, you selected a consultant that was doing two other projects that had a great deal of impact on the outcome of the PEIS, the Dowd Canyon study, the Eagle/Avon study.</p> <p>It just -- folks, it looks so bad. Do I want to say there was a conflict of interest there? You know, I sort of agree with Miller. I think that's an issue for a courtroom to prove.</p> <p>And it's just been a waste of time and money, folks. And it's really been sad. And you guys now have an opportunity to do this better. And I hope you've listened to all of us. I hope you're not, as you do on page 36, just simply dismiss what your current alternative would do to Clear Creek County, what it would do to the communities to the west of Clear Creek County. Clean this up in the supplement, please.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	370	Callison, Anne	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Good evening. I'm Anne Callison, a resident of Denver. I think Chuck Stearns hit it right on the head. Let's face it, this is about the dollars. Tom Norton said, We want to build one to double the capacity to Eagle County and perhaps in Summit. They do want to destroy Denver International Airport. They do want to promote Eagle County Airport. That's why one of the consultants on this project was forced to change the travel demand of a certain bridge in Eagle County from 10,000 vehicles per day 30,000 vehicles per day.</p> <p>I think what we're going to see in the end is you are going to see Eagle County expanded. We're probably going to see the size of the plane and the capacity increased for Eagle County Airport. And the rest of us will be left with 10 to 15 years of construction on I-70.</p> <p>You've heard me say before that I don't ski a lot in Colorado anymore. I've actually this year skied seven days in another state. I've only skied one day in Colorado, which, of course, now means it's cost me \$329 because I bought the Colorado Card. That won't happen again.</p> <p>I would like to see, and very shortly, what's going to happen with the supplement to this PEIS. Many of us have pointed out repeatedly the grievous deficiencies in this document, the lack of an economic impact study for Clear Creek County, Summit County, and Eagle County, and, quite frankly, for Denver and Jefferson County, and the rest of us here in metro Denver from the 15 years of construction.</p> <p>I want to know what happened with the errata sheet that was issued January 4 when you said that you had not included the 3 million transit trips from Summit Stage and the Avon/Beaver Creek transit group. You've mentioned that there's 224 recreational sites within three miles of I-70. I want everyone involved in this study to go back and get a vision.</p> <p>I want you to understand that, as in Europe, Americans will adapt. We will take a monorail to the mountains. We will take a taxi or a jib to the mountains. If we're staying in a condominium or a hotel, there will be van service to a trailhead or directly to a lift. Things will change in this country because we want it to. Many of us have traveled to Europe and we've experienced the beauty of rail and not having to rent a car. Or if you're going to Aspen for a day, we'll rent what's called a station car, just like you do in downtown Denver now if you live in a condominium down there.</p> <p>Also, at the next two public hearings I would like to hear what's going to happen during the period between February 26 and the end of the public comment period. When are we going to see the elements of the supplement to this PEIS? And what are going to be the opportunities for we, the public, to continue to comment during the extended public comment period?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	444	Calo, B	Public	4/20/2005	<p>1) By closing off consideration of a birail transit system, you're only considering widening some spots - aren't you just trading current bottle necks for new ones? PLEASE continue to investigate rail - it's quiet, efficient, and can be expanded with additional cars/trains. By only doing work on the existing highway in limited spots, only the illusion of improved conditions along the corridor exist. The accidents and back-ups will not change, only worsen.</p> <p>2) Noise - we live just off of I70 at Genesee exit. The freeway noise is so loud at peak times that we cannot carry on a conversation outside. Brick "sound barrier" walls DO NOT WORK!!! All they do is bounce the noise to some other location SOME of the time. Outdoor acoustics cannot be controlled. The only things that may do some actual mitigation are dirt and foliage - the burms are the only thing to consider (between burms and walls) - planting foliage/trees are nowhere in the PEIS. Don't waste our taxes on walls.</p> <p>- Barbara Calo</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	401	Campbell, Lee	Public	3/23/2005	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why not a southern route Eagle and Summit Counties were nothing until I-70.</li> <li>2. Please consider removing the tunnels at the east end of Idaho Springs. They are a huge bottleneck.</li> <li>3. Traffic on I-70 is only seriously backed up 37 days a year. Three summer holidays and weekends</li> </ol>	Form



during ski season. I can't see how it is worth it to tear up the Clear Creek Valley for 10-15 years to construct a highway that will be obsolete when done, the economy adversely effected, and many historical sites damaged. Please don't expand the road past it's present footprint.

Categorized Comment	752	Campione, Mark	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion), Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	520	Canales, Jhoselyne	Public	5/20/2005	<p>Jhoselyne Axie Canales Skyview Expeditionary Learning High School jhoselyne@aol.com</p> <p>My Concerns</p> <p>It's true we all need to find a way to fix the I-70 traffic problem for many reasons, the most important one the economy. It is also true we need to look at the needs of the towns along the corridor, too. So why are we just focusing on expanding the highway?</p> <p>We can't just ruin the main business of those towns. Towns like Idaho Springs whose main business is historical properties, could be destroyed because that history will need to be destroyed in order to expand the highway. We also shouldn't just think about tourist, but also about the people already leaving in Colorado. There will be a lot of people who will lose their houses because of the highway expansion. Expanding the highway will also affect Clear Creek County, the pollution is already to high and with more cars it'll be worst. We have other alternatives that don't make that much pollution. Besides, gasoline is sooner or later going to run out. The water is contaminated enough and it could get even more contaminated with more cars. So all these reasons lead to the statement: Don't chose to expand the highway.</p> <p>A better choice could be the Monorail many towns agree on that because it won't ruin or touch the towns in any way. I believe that if we don't have enough money we need to figure out a way to get some because we are all going to benefit out of this.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	45	Cannistraro, Bob	Public	1/15/2005	<p>I believe widening I-70 from Floyd Hill to the Eisenhower tunnel and beyond should not be done - having a "T-Rex" through these areas would create a very bad situation and when complete the vehicle traffic would still be very bad. please investigate all other alternatives throughly including a monorail or using the existing railroad right-of-way</p> <p>Thank You</p> <p>Bob Cannistraro Boulder</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	650	Town of Mnturn Municipalities		5/20/2005	<p>Town of Mnturn 302 Pine Street P.O. box 309 Minturn, CO 81645</p> <p>May 20, 2005</p> <p>Ms. Cecilia Joy, Project Manager CDOT, Region #1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Re: I-70 Comments Draft PEIS</p> <p>After considerable Town Council debate and public input at public hearings on the matter of I-70 proposals for various alternatives and, following are issues of concern and comment from the citizens of Minturn and Minturn Town Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Town of Minturn supports the AGS mode of transportation – however the proposals do not specify how to disperse the passengers once they arrive at their destination point.</li> <li>2. Town of Minturn supports the added lane where necessary – however serious consideration And mitigation has to occur in geographical area where an added lane would decimate small historic towns that have been located along I-70 for over hundreds of years.</li> <li>3. Town of Minturn has serious concerns about the I-70 Dowd Junction interchange and the proposed tunnel at Dowd Junction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The entry and exit lanes must remain to the Town of Minturn on both sides least bound and west bound traffic) of the proposed tunnel – a diamond like interchange must be constructed to accomplish this.</li> <li>(b) During construction period of the proposed tunnel – how will CDOT address the Traffic detours to accomplish the construction of the tunnel – will the traffic be detoured through Minturn? Eagle-Vail? – currently there are no specific proposals.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Ensure that current bike paths will remain compatible with the I-70 corridor and ensure that Future bike paths are designed to follow the constructed changes.</li> <li>5. Minturn Town Council has serious concerns that the study does not address how the proposed projects will be funded?</li> <li>6. Should the AGS system be the choice as an alternative, the priority for construction should be reviewed and consideration be given first to construct the AGS – thus the public can use the AGS and then begin the construction of tunnels interchanges for the expansion of I-70.</li> </ol> <p>The above concerns and comments shall be submitted to CDOT as directed. Should you need further clarification of the above, please do not hesitate to call Minturn Town Manager, Ann Capela at (970) 827-5645 or email at manager@minturn.org.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ann K. Capela, Town Manager – On behalf of Minturn Town Council</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	712	Carbone, Claudia	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Mass transit is the lesser of two evils, the other being congestion and pollution along the I-70 corridor. There's another condition that must go with mass transit: a vast, effective infrastructure of transportation around the county. You can't just dump hoardes of people up here w/o a way to move them. And that, again, must be a mass transit system (bus, rail) to cut down on pollution. (Can't we just close the gate!)</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	48	Caren, S	Public	1/17/2005	<p>CDOT is focusing on the WRONG problem. The problem is not that there are not enough roads. The problem is there are TOO MANY people. Even if I-70 could handle 3 times the volume, where would the mountain communities put these people?</p> <p>We need to control and even stop the growth in the Front Range but this will never happen.</p> <p>I-70 has more than adequate capacity 95% of the time. The people using it must either accept that there are problems 5% of the time or use it other times.</p> <p>Any "improvements" will be a major inconvenience to the Colorado residents who presently live here and the problem will be just as bad a short time after the construction is completed.</p> <p>Where is the funding for these new roads going to come from? If development pays for itself, the new roads are needed for the new people moving to the State and the increased revenue from these people should pay for the new roads. Historically it does not, and taxes on present residents will have to be raised to pay for the new roads.</p> <p>A final note. To me, this doesn't matter. I live in Summit County. I've been a full or part time resident</p>	Online

here for 25 years and a Colorado Resident for 30. Summit County is no longer a rural mountain community. It is now a suburb of Denver. By the time anything gets started, I will have left the State.

Categorized Comment	285	US Army Corps of Engineers	Federal Agencies	3/7/2005	March 7, 2005	Written
					<p>Ms. Jean Wallace Federal Highway Administration Colorado Division 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228</p> <p>Dear Ms. Wallace:</p> <p>This letter constitutes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) comments regarding the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. The Corps' review focused on impacts to the aquatic ecosystem, including wetlands, streams, lakes and riparian areas. Comments in this letter supplement earlier comments provided during two internal cooperating-agency reviews.</p> <p>As you're aware, while completion of the Tier 1 EIS will not result in a request to the Corps for authorization under Section 404 or the Clean Water Act, subsequent Tier 2 documents will result in such requests for authorization. Therefore, as another federal agency with decisions to make regarding the I-70 Mountain Corridor, the Corps must insure that the Tier 1 alternatives evaluation and elimination process complies with the 404(b)(1) guidelines. With this letter, I am pleased to advise you that the PEIS complies with 40 CFR Part 230. More specifically, the least environmentally damaging (to the aquatic ecosystem) practicable alternative has not been eliminated.</p> <p>Thank you for addressing our earlier comments on the Draft PEIS. If you have any questions concerning the above comment, please contact me at (303) 979-4120.</p> <p>Sincerely, Timothy T. Carey Chief, Denver Regulatory Office</p> <p>CF:</p> <p>Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation 18500 East Colfax Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Anthony Curtis U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Frisco Regulatory Office 3110 West Main, Suite 202 PO Box 607 Frisco, CO 80443</p>	
Categorized Comment	97	Carlson, Lara	Public	1/31/2005	<p>It is unfortunate that the rail system is not the highest "preferred" method in relieving congestion through the I-70 mountain corridor. As an avid skier and backpacker, I use I-70 frequently throughout the year. I find it worthwhile to be slowed down by traffic both going from and coming back to Denver because there are no other viable options. I would be much more likely to use a train than a bus because trains tend to be faster, more environmentally friendly, and would cause less damage to the land upon which the corridor exists. Judging by the unexpected degree of success of RTD's FasTracks program, it seems to me that people in the Denver area have proven their willingness to fund and use railroads. Buses are an unfortunate necessity in Denver because train tracks just can't be laid everywhere Denverites need to go. When better options are available, I believe they ought to be implemented despite the higher cost. The next generation and the ones after that deserve our sacrifice now for a better and cleaner future Colorado.</p> <p>Lara Carlson, Englewood</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	89	Carlson, Ron	Public	1/28/2005	<p>Three general comments. The PEIS is too limited in scope to solve the problem. Bottom Line:</p> <p>1) A whole new highway a toll road (call it new US40?) should be built north of I-70 from Floyd Hill to Georgetown or even possibly to Winter Park. 2) A car carrier trucking system should be available at all major collection point entrances east of Evergreen on Fridays and Saturdays to load up private vehicle and haul them up to destinations and be available at mountain destination entrances on Sundays and (Holiday) Mondays to "car pool" the vehicles instead of the people.</p> <p>The three major problems as I see it are (1)to physically improve the highway, ie quality, safety (2) provide an alternative to handle volume i.e. peak loads, ski traffic and summer weekends and (3) pay for it.</p> <p>The physical improvements to the highway depend on the solutions to 2 and 3 A study should be done as to what people will do under various alternatives. Most people will not tolerate 15 years of construction. This could kill the mountain economy.</p> <p>It would be best to have a whole new toll road built then switch traffic over. Then renovate I-70 if that is still desirable. This would address the concerns of the mountain towns about noise, construction, footprint etc. This would address financing as it could be a toll road. This would make the ski areas more competitive with Utah where its only 45 minutes from Salt Lake to the ski areas. If a parallel freeway was built it could be extended with a tunnel to Winter Park which would lead to more development there, spread out the traffic and indirectly help Steamboat.</p> <p>The study should have considered the difficulty in getting people out of their cars. A study should be done as to what people will use.</p> <p>The A guideway will not work its too bus-like and people will resist. A monorail or other fixed guideway will not work unless there is some public transportation at the mountain destinations that is convenient and goes to remote places. There are already car carriers for the auto business. With some minor modifications a fast loading comfortable design could be made with perhaps some kind of tandem club car for passengers during the ride up the hill and back.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	248	Carr, Ron	Public	2/24/2005	<p>2103 Bennett Avenue Glenwood Springs, CO 81601 February 24, 2005</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I would like to make two points concerning the I-70 corridor near Glenwood Springs.</p> <p>First: Glenwood Canyon is beautiful but is subject to natural disasters such as the recent rock slide. A more serious disaster could close I-70 for months. Serious consideration should be given to developing an alternate route that would relieve some of the pressure off I-70 and be available in case of a disaster. Such a route could be through Cottonwood Pass. This Pass could also accommodate the two guide ways as well, with fewer problems than going through Glenwood Canyon. This would take people to the heart of the Roaring Fork Valley, including Aspen, which would be a big boost to the tourism industry.</p> <p>Second: Highway 82 connects with I-70 in Glenwood Springs. Highway 82 (Grand Avenue) goes directly through Glenwood Springs and is scheduled for gridlock in ten or fifteen years. An alternate route for this highway will have to be built to get traffic through Glenwood. The only feasible route is Midland Avenue. A vote of the people of Glenwood Springs back in the 80's also determined that Midland Avenue is the best location for the Highway 82 bypass. Some of the city council members in Glenwood want the Highway 82 bypass to be built on the old D&amp;RGW's railroad corridor. This old corridor is owned by the seven or eight government entities of the Roaring Fork Valley, and many believe these entities would never give up this corridor for a Highway 82 bypass. RFTA has tentative plans to develop this corridor to provide some form of rail service up and down the Roaring Fork Valley, along with a trail for bike and foot traffic.</p> <p>The I-70 corridor improvements must include plans for a Highway 82 interchange to take traffic via the Midland Avenue route, therefore bypassing Grand Avenue in Glenwood Springs. This interchange should entail a new bridge over the Colorado River. The old bridge is too small and for all practical purposes, probably already condemned. I will be extremely interested in observing the progress of the Mountain Corridor hearings.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Ron Carr 970-945-8705</p>	Written

Categorized Comment	202	Carrick, Michael	Public	2/20/2005	I am against any form of modification to I-70 with the exception of a monorail system. The latest proposals should be thrown out because of their intrusiveness to the land and wildlife, not to mention the great degree of loss of income for all the mountain communities and ski centers. Five to six years for a AGS is alot easier to bear than 15+ years of construction. Also, has anyone given any thought of the impact toward homeowners during these years of change? How about tolls? A person should be able to prove residence in a particular area or county to avoid toll fees, some of us actually have to use I-70 to commute back and forth to work. If drivers are still utilizing the I-70 roadway, they shouldn't have to pay a toll, you should make up the toll charges from people who want to use the AGS. Mchael & Patty Carrick	Online
Categorized Comment	749	Casbon, Lew	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  No action (but continue \$532 million in already planned improvements), Minimal action - fix 'choke' points, modify travel demand (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  You asked for this to be submitted by May 3. I received it on 4 May.	Written
Categorized Comment	273	Casciano, Jessica	Public	3/5/2005	I think the wise decision for the I-70 corridor is to install a monorail. It is time that we live in the future of our technology which can allow improvements in quality of life and the quality of the environment. We share and adopt so many things worldwide; why not adopt the monorail, a great transportation system that other countries use and benefit from.	Online
Categorized Comment	448	Cassin, Lee	Public	4/25/2005	To Whom It May Concern: I am writing to request that the improvements to I-70 should be strongly transit-oriented. Continuing to add lanes is putting one's finger in the dike and will cost taxpayers continually, as more and more congestion leads to more lanes. A skier train is crucial to our state's economy and environment. Please change the criteria that unfairly penalize the transit option. The mountain towns' air quality, climate and quality of life depend on a better solution.  Thank you, Lee Cassin	Online
Categorized Comment	62	Castens, Dave	Public	1/12/2005	As a fifteen years plus resident of Clear Creek County, I feel it would be piracy to charge me and my family a toll to drive the I-70 Corridor. I personally would run the toll booth without stopping or paying a toll. This is totally unconstitutional.	Form
Categorized Comment	555	Cavarraa, Anthony	Public	5/23/2005	I think CDOT should do the AGS system would be the best because it will work and you have to read my essay.  The pollution cars is very high because if they put a six lane highway in then the pollution will be even higher than what it is now. With the AGS system (Advanced Guide Way System) will not put any pollution out because it is ran off of magnets. The weather will not mess up the AGS train up. There will be less noise also less noise with the train because the train doesn't have an engine.  The traffic is horrible it is like rush hour when it is noon on a Monday and with the AGS the people will ride the train and not use as much energy as we are using to day. Also we will get a lot more tourist and that means more money for us and the tourist wont be as mad with the traffic and they will have fun instead of sitting in the traffic jams.  The future for me is that I can think about having to pay a lot of taxes for it. I will take my family on a trip and we won't be sitting in traffic and we will have fun going to look at the mountains. People in Idaho Springs don't think they are being heard and are think they need to be heard. People say that there wont be anything to see with the AGS system because it is high in the air. But they could look at it on the way back down but if they drive throw our state well it is a better idea to have AGS because of no pollution.  I think that CDOT should go with the idea of the AGS system because it wont put any pollution out. I think CDOT need to look in to our future with all the pollution cars put out and the AGS system doesn't put any pollution out rethink your idea.	Online
Categorized Comment	730	Cervenka, Jim	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Mnimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  More lanes is not an answer. But, recreationalists are not likely to carry bikes, kayaks, camping gear, etc. on a mass-transit vehicle either. How to get from the mass transit station to the ultimate destination? How to also accommodate those of us off the I-70 corridor who are also impacted by the congestion. We also rely on I-70. Are there alternate routes that could take some of the pressure off I-70? It does not appear that CDOT has put much creative thought into this ever-so important task. Jim Cervenka.cervenka@rkymtnhi.com 236 Lakeview Dr., Grand Lake, 80447	Written
Categorized Comment	404	Chase, Jerry	Public	2/26/2005	Without having heard, you know, any presentation, I'm in favor of some rail alternative.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	629	Christopherson, Daisy	Public	5/18/2005	Dear Ms. Cecelia Joy,  As a former Colorado resident, and one who continues to enjoy vacationing in that beautiful state, I felt I needed to express my concerns about the proposed widening of I-70.  I have driven that route west of Denver many times, and agree that something must be done, but widening the road to allow more cars is not the solution, and is very short-sighted in its attempt.  I have studied the various proposals (PEIS) from HOV lanes to fixed guideway rapid transit, and am convinced that the fixed guideway, using rail, is the best alternative.  Yes, there is more upfront financial cost for this project versus the highway widening. But you must, must consider the environmental and health problems and concerns posed by a wider highway - a highway that will quickly be outgrown as soon as it is widened.  The cost of this to Colorado's environment (and tourist industry) is immeasurable! Everyone loves Colorado for its beautiful vistas and wildlife; many of these would suffer serious degradation as a result of highway widening.  It is simply not responsible to continue to favor or cater to vehicles as the primary mode of transit. It is vastly inefficient and especially in these days of high oil prices. We need a rail system there - we cannot pretend that highway widening would be a long-term solution.  Mass transit is the only option that makes sense for the future. People will be able to get where they want to go with the least impact on the earth.  Thank you for your consideration.  Sincerely,  Daisy Christopherson 1320 Heritage Drive/176 Northfield, MN 55057	Written
Categorized Comment	440	Clark, Lester	Public	4/10/2005	Colorado Department of Transportation C/O J.F. Sato and Associates 5898 South Rapp Street Littleton, Co. 80120  I am Les Clark, have attended two of your public meetings on I-70. I have lived 42 years in Clear Creek County; from 1929 to 1948, and 1982 until present. During the time not here, I was in California. Fifteen years of that time was in the Central Valley, before NEPA and citizen input; the answer to traffic problems at that time was to widen and build more and more freeways. The problems are still with	Written

them except where Rapid transit was designed and built. I see the same thing happening on I-70 as outlined in your PEIS.

Some of my concerns which I hope will be considered are:

1. Keep all work within present rightway in Clear Creek County. Explore all alternatives such as reversing travel lanes in peak periods, work with business to change peak travel periods to periods of less use. Promote greater use of multi-passenger vehicles.
2. Do a complete study of light rail or like conveyence. It appears that unrealistic financial cap was put on this type of conveyence by CDOT of other parties. We had a narrow gauge R.R. serving the county until 1940.
3. Investigate methods of off-site or some means to mitigate the proposed construction time of up to 15 years. This period of time will be very difficult for many of the local business to survive.
4. Clear Creek Counties' remaining Historical sites should be preserved at all costs. This County is designated as one the Most Endangered places with over 840 historic resource sites.
5. Alternate ways to detour during construction, rather 1 or 15 years, must be found. Studies elsewhere have shown that air pollution from cars and trucks can have a serious effect on health, and in particular our young people.
6. The 20 year period that CDOT has chosen for funding limit of captical construction is artificial and contrary to financial practices of the real world. Transit projects can be bonded for 30 year periods. Changing I-70 funding period from 20 to 30 years would increase the capital funds by almost 50% from 4 to 6 billion. This would enable mass transit facilities to be built rather than widening.
7. CDOT has done an outstanding job of protecting values in Glenwood Canyon. This shows that traffic can be managed and still protect the enviornment and historic values.

Sincerely,

Lester D. Clark

cc Cecelia Joy, CDOT, 18500 East Cofax, Aurora, Co.

Categorized Comment	561	Clark, Thomas	Municipalities	5/23/2005	To: FHWA and CDOT 5/17/2005 From: Thomas A. Clark, Mayor Town of Kremmling Mining Engineer, CSM '83 Re: Future tunneling for vehicles Proposal for study	Online
	<p>As a member of the I-70 coalition and with respect to the PEIS, we were asked to think outside the box on possible solutions to the I-70 congestion. As an engineer I know the difficulties with tunnels (size, cost, ventilation), as present methods require oversized tunnels to handle exhaust. I thought that if we could somehow get vehicles smoothly on and off a flatcar or conveyor system that is propelled through the tunnel on electric or pneumatic power with the vehicle engine turned off, then the size and ventilation requirements of the tunnel would be greatly reduced.</p> <p>I realize the difficulties in designing such a system, however, I have seen the advantages of the "People Movers" at theme parks and there effectiveness of moving large numbers of people quickly and efficiently. Why not a vehicle mover?</p> <p>I propose some money be spent on studies to see if this is possible/feasible in the near future. The money could be spent on graduate studies at CSU's mechanical engineering department and CSMS mining engineering department. There has been great advances in using high pressure water jets for tunnel boring that make it a more viable option for some of the problem areas along the corridor (Floyd hill, Georgetown/SilverPlume, EJMT, Minturn).</p> <p>I would be willing to help with this effort. Please feel free to contact me at the Town Hall in Kremmling</p> <p>Very Truly Yours, Thomas A. Clark</p>					

Categorized Comment	694	Clear Creek County Planning Commission	Counties	5/24/2005	Clear Creek County Post Office Box 2000 Georgetown, Colorado 80444 Telephone: (303) 569-3251 (303) 679-2300  24 May 2005  Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 E. Cofax Ave. Aurora, CO 80011  Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 W. Dakota Ave. Lakewood, CO 80228	Written
	<p>The Clear Creek County Planning Commission submits the following comments on the DPEIS for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. We appreciate the extended period for public comment and hope to see a response to the serious issues we raise. We request that our comments be entered into the administrative record.</p> <p>DPEIS</p> <p>The I-70 DPEIS focuses on broad approaches to address travel demand and the performance of transportation systems within the I-70 corridor. This broad review is considered standard by CDOT in a Tier 1 policy-level NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) document. A Tier 2 NEPA document would be required for any future specific action, for example, construction/modification of a new/existing interchange on I-70.</p> <p>ISSUES</p> <p>As the DPEIS is a broad review of the transportation alternatives within the context of the various communities and environmental settings of the corridor, the best way to evaluate this document from the Planning Department's perspective is through review of the various land use policy documents (master plans), as adopted by the Clear Creek County Planning Commission. The two master plans adopted by the Clear Creek County Planning Commission are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Clear Creek Intercounty Non-motorized Routes Master Plan (adopted 17 December 1990); and</li> <li>• The Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030 (adopted 17 December 2003)</li> </ul> <p>These two plans serve to outline the goals and objectives of the County with regard to land use decisions, and establish guiding principles for all development in the unincorporated area of the County. It is the intent of this report, to determine whether the DPEIS adequately addresses the two master planning documents as adopted by the County pursuant to CRS 30-28-109, thereby determining whether the DPEIS adequately addresses the County's goals and objectives, and guiding principals for development in the corridor.</p> <p>DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT Clear Creek Intercounty Non-motorized Routes Master Plan</p> <p>The DPEIS does not contain any reference to the Clear Creek County Intercounty Non-motorized Routes Master Plan. It is therefore requested (in accordance with NEPA requirements), that the DPEIS be amended to include discussion of this policy document. The Clear Creek Intercounty Non-motorized Routes Master Plan was adopted pursuant to CRS 30-28-109, by the Clear Creek County Planning Commission on December 17, 1990.</p> <p>A primary goal of this plan is that separate non-motorized alignments be created wherever practical along the corridors identified within this document (including the I-70 corridor) to reduce the likelihood of conflict between motorized and non-motorized corridor users. It is evident that all of the alternatives (other than the 'No Action' alternative) would have a significant impact on the ability of Clear Creek County to achieve this goal. How do each of the alternatives address this issue? Which alternative would be most compatible with this desired goal?</p> <p>In accordance with CEQ - Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1502.16(c)), if there are immediate conflicts with local land use plans or policies, or if conflicts could arise in the future, the environmental impact statement must acknowledge and describe the extent of those conflicts. As conflicts with the various alternatives will clearly arise in the future, it is requested that in accordance with legal requirements for the preparation of a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, CDOT address this issue.</p> <p>Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030 The Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030 was adopted by the Clear Creek County Planning Commission in accordance with CRS 30-28-106 and 107 on December 17, 2003. The Master Plan serves to establish guiding principles for all development in the County, and is intended to communicate</p>					

the land use policy of Clear Creek County to citizens, landowners, development interests and other governmental jurisdictions.

As required in accordance with CEQ - Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1502.16(c)), during development of the DPEIS, CDOT should first inquire of the relevant County, whether there are any potential conflicts with local land use plans policies or controls. Further, as stated in CEQ - Regulations for Implementing NEPA, this contact "should be solicited early and should be carefully acknowledged and answered."

Excepting a statement in Section 3.10.2.5 acknowledging the general desire of the County to achieve the 'goals and objectives' of the Clear Creek County Master Plan, and a statement in Section 3.10.3.3 acknowledging that project alternatives "may cause conflicts with planning goals", the DPEIS fails to address conflicts with specific 'goals and objectives' as outlined in Chapter 2 of the Master Plan.

If known or potential waste sites are identified, the locations should be marked on a map showing their relationship to the alternatives under consideration. If a known or potential hazardous waste site is affected by an alternative, information about the site, the potential involvement, impacts and public health concerns of the affected alternative(s), and the proposed mitigation measures to eliminate or minimize impacts on public health concerns should be discussed in the Tier 1 stage during the DPEIS (FHWA Technical Advisory T 6640.8A Guidance For Preparing And Processing Environmental And Section 4(F) Documents (October 30, 1987) V.G.20). Clear Creek County has identified 23 millsites in which past activities would indicate potential hazardous materials (e.g. mercury, cyanide, heavy metals concentrations) which warrant analysis as to each alternatives' impacts. These millsites are: Dixie, Silver Spruce, Sampler, Clear Creek, Gem, Waltham, Big Five, Jackson, Mxell, Ruth, Whale, Hoosac, Dover, Clear Creek Gilpin, Red Elephant, Swansea, Commonwealth, Centennial, Payrock, Mendota, Smuggler, Silver Leaf, and Baltimore Mills.

At this time, it is therefore requested, that the DPEIS acknowledge all existing and potential conflicts with the goals and objectives of the Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030. Further, as required by NEPA regulations, the DPEIS should "evaluate the seriousness of the impact of the proposal on the land use plans and policies, and whether, or how much, the proposal will impair the effectiveness of land control mechanisms for the area."

While the DPEIS acknowledges the existence of some of the 'goals and objectives' of the Clear Creek County Master Plan, simple acknowledgment of these goals is not consistent with NEPA requirements for preparation of a DPEIS. Specifically, it is contended that the DPEIS does not adequately address the following goals as outlined in Section 2 of the Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030:

- (Goal 2-1) To encourage development proposals that will balance the County's personal, cultural, environmental and economic values.
- (Goal 2-2) To direct the extent of urban development to municipalities and designated mixed use areas, and to establish a hierarchy of mixed-use, pedestrian and transit oriented urban centers;
- (Goal 2-5) To prepare for a balanced inter-modal and multi-modal transportation system that addresses issues including safety, operations, economics, maintenance, and overall efficiency; and

#### Goal 2-1

The ability for Clear Creek County to balance the County's personal, cultural, environmental and economic values as outlined in Goal 2-1 of the Master Plan will clearly differ greatly depending on the final alternative selected. This is particularly true during the construction phase of the project (2010-2025) when the impact on the economy of Clear Creek County will be at its greatest.

CDOT's approach to this issue is that "Tier 2 studies will provide information regarding how long work would persist at any given location and will indicate what diversions, detours, land closings and other disturbances would occur. Tier 2 studies also will include measures to avoid and minimize impacts on Clear Creek communities along I-70." This surely must be addressed as part of the Tier 1 analysis, as the only transportation alternative that does not conflict with Goal 2-1 of the Master Plan (the AGS) appears to have been ruled out based on the arbitrary \$4 billion "reasonable criteria" prior to any Tier 2 analysis taking place.

Corridor mobility during an extended construction period is not considered in the DPEIS. Alternatives are assumed complete by 2025 and evaluated based on meeting baseline year 2025 travel demand, however mobility during the construction period is not addressed. The Planning Commission believes this is a seriously lacking issue because the interstate has several uses that will be critically impacted by a 15 year construction period. Some of these uses are national defense, emergency services accessibility, interstate/intrastate transport, and locals access to employment (approximately 60% of County residents commute outside of the County to work). Especially critical is emergency services accessibility and interstate/intrastate transport when they relate to transportation of hazardous materials. The DPEIS does not set forth a proposed construction schedule (other than the duration of 15 years from 2010 to 2025), explain how the construction process for the preferred alternatives will be managed, or how mobility in the Corridor will be maintained during the construction period. More consideration of the scheduling and management of the project to minimize travel impacts is needed to ensure that negative impacts to mountain corridor communities and the state economy can be avoided.

Goal 2-1 of the Master Plan would not be achieved if no alternative transportation system is in place during the construction phase of the project thereby making it highly unlikely that any commercial enterprises will be seeking to establish a business in any of these localities until after 2025.

It should also be pointed out, that Section 3.9 of the DPEIS, (and specifically Charts 3.9-15 to 3.9-17 and Section J.1.4) which compare the economic impacts of the various transportation alternatives in groups such as "Highway", "Transit" and "Combination of Highway/Transit" on Clear Creek County and the region are inadequate because information is not available on Clear Creek County specifically. These graphs indicate that employment and gross regional product will continue to increase during the construction phase of the project, and as stated on page 3.9.3.3, the REMI model concludes that "an absolute downturn in travel and visitor spending from existing levels is not indicated." In order to understand the economic impacts of the various alternatives, an analysis reporting detailed economic impacts for each county is appropriate.

The conclusions of the REMI model with regard to Clear Creek County is highly questionable. Nevertheless, this is not why the graphs in Section 3.9 are considered by the Clear Creek County Planning Commission to be inadequate. These graphs are not sufficient, as they do not address the fact that the infrastructure to support economic growth is only available within the County along the I-70 corridor. The economic impact analysis within the DPEIS does not adequately address conflicts with Goal 2-1 of the Master Plan, as it only provides information with regard to the economic impact of the highway and transit alternatives as broad groups, and that no analysis exists within the DPEIS of the transit and highway alternatives with regard to their specific impacts on the local economy.

It is therefore requested that the DPEIS be supplemented at the Tier 1 stage, to include an analysis of the impacts for each of the alternatives, specifically with regard to the personal, cultural, environmental, and economic impact on the areas within the county with infrastructure (transit nodes and mixed use areas, i.e. the I-70 Corridor), rather than just an analysis of the County as a whole, as is currently the case. If there are conflicts (as there surely will be), as required in accordance with CEQ - Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1502.16(c)), the DPEIS should be supplemented to acknowledge and describe the extent of those conflicts, and to evaluate the seriousness of the impact of these conflicts.

#### Goal 2-2 and Goal 2-5

There is very little land suitable for development in the Clear Creek Corridor. As such, efficiency of land use, and the desire to focus urban development around existing urban centers is extremely important to the county. This desire to focus growth around transportation nodes is reflected in Goal 2-2, and Goal 2-5 of the Master Plan.

As CDOT transportation planners are surely aware, rural and village development (such as can be found along the I-70 corridor in Clear Creek County) can be shaped by the use of public transportation to maximize the efficiency of land use, traditional transportation, and alternative transportation modes. In order to effectively direct the extent of urban development to municipalities (TC) and designated mixed use areas (MU), transit nodes (or Gateways) have been identified within the Master Plan at Idaho Springs, Georgetown, Floyd Hill, Dumont/Lawson, and the I-70/SH40 Interchange. Map 4.6 (attached) from the Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030 identifies these locations. The I-70 corridor has always had a symbiotic relationship with development, therefore any alterations to the corridor will have a significant impact on the County's current and anticipated development. Because of this relationship, the County is uniquely concerned about the amount of useable land that would be taken up by improvements to I-70.

The DPEIS in Section 3.9.3.3 acknowledges construction impacts with regard to economic growth in Clear Creek County, however there is absolutely no mention in the DPEIS of the effects of a 15 year construction project with regard to its impact on land-use planning. In fact, the only reference made in the DPEIS to conflicts with Goals 2-2 or Goal 2-5 of the Master Plan, is on page ES-42, where a short statement has been included indicating that "transit alternatives would be expected to concentrate induced growth in urban areas surrounding transit centers, or in areas of existing planned urban development," while "highway alternatives would be expected to distribute growth based on existing trends for urban/rural development." This is the equivalent of "sprawl" which our master plan tries to avoid. It is acknowledged that this statement is consistent with the basic principles of Transit Oriented Development, however this statement by no means adequately addresses potential conflicts with Goals 2-2 and 2-5 of the Master Plan during the actual construction period (2010-2025).

No analysis of the ability of the alternatives to meet the objectives of Goals 2-2 and 2-5 within the context of the 2025 planning horizon (construction period) currently exists within the DPEIS. To expand on this statement, it was determined by CDOT, that 2025 is the planning horizon within which the benefits of each of the corridor alternatives is to be analyzed. It is therefore logical, that the ability of the various alternatives to meet the objectives of the Clear Creek County Master Plan must also be analyzed in the context of this planning horizon.

It is considered that the biggest obstacle to economic diversification in Clear Creek County is the lack of land with adequate infrastructure (sewer and water) to accommodate development. Unfortunately, this infrastructure is mostly available within the areas identified as transit nodes (Gateways) and mixed use areas (MU) on the attached Master Plan map (see Map 4.6). The required infrastructure to support economic development is not available on the eastern side of the county, and the statement on page 3-9 of the DPEIS which indicates that "almost 90% of new construction occurred in the unincorporated portions of the county", while correct, is misleading as this construction is accounted for almost entirely by construction of single family residences, and not commercial construction. As stated earlier in the Memo, the Master Plan has identified much of the I-70 corridor as the area to encourage development through identifying transit nodes and mixed use areas. Unfortunately, it is these identified transit nodes and mixed use areas with existing infrastructure (water and sewer) that will be most affected during the 15 year construction phase of the project.

All other alternatives (except the AGS with 6-lane Highway alternative) conflict with these goals. It is therefore requested, that the DPEIS be amended at the Tier 1 Stage, to include an analysis of which alternatives are consistent with Goals 2-2 and 2-5 of the Clear Creek County Master Plan, and which alternatives conflict with these goals, specifically during the 2010-2025 construction period. If there are conflicts (as there surely will be), as required in accordance with CEQ - Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1502.16(c)), the DPEIS should be amended to acknowledge and describe the extent of those conflicts, and to evaluate the seriousness of the impact of these conflicts.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In consideration of the two master Plans adopted by the Clear Creek County Planning Commission; the Clear Creek Intercounty Non-motorized Routes Master Plan and the Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030, the Planning Commission has found deficiencies in the DPEIS that should be further addressed as described below.

\* It is requested (in accordance with NEPA requirements), that the DPEIS be amended to include discussion of the Clear Creek Intercounty Non-motorized Routes Master Plan.

\* It is requested that the DPEIS be supplemented at the Tier 1 stage, to include an analysis of the economic impacts for each of the alternatives, specifically with regard to Goal 2-1 that indicates the County's desire to balance the personal, cultural, environmental, and economic impact on the areas within the County with infrastructure (transit nodes and mixed use areas), rather than just an analysis of the County as a whole, as is currently the case.

\* The biggest obstacle to economic diversification in Clear Creek County is the lack of land with adequate infrastructure to accommodate development. This infrastructure is mostly available within the areas identified as transit nodes and mixed use areas.

\* The DPEIS should be amended at the Tier 1 Stage, to include an analysis of which alternatives are consistent with Goals 2-2 and 2-5 of the Clear Creek County Master Plan, and which alternatives conflict with these goals, specifically during the 2010-2025 construction period.

\* Corridor mobility is critical during an extended construction period.

Sincerely,

The Members of the Clear Creek County Planning Commission

cc: Clear Creek Board of County Commissioners  
 City of Central  
 City of Idaho Springs  
 Town of Empire  
 Town of Georgetown  
 Town of Silver Plume  
 U.S. Senator Wayne Allard  
 U.S. Senator Ken Salazar  
 U.S. Representative Mark Udall  
 CO Senate President Joan Fitz-Gerald  
 CO Representative Tom Plant

Note there are two Master Plan Maps attached to letter.

Categorized Comment	456	Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation	Associations & Special Interest Groups	4/28/2005	Clear Creek County Economic Profile 2004	Written
<p>Clear Creek County's population for 2004 is estimated at 9,649 and forecast at 9,782 in 2005. This represents a 28.39% increase in 15 years. Most of the population growth has taken place in the unincorporated areas of the County. Our population rank is 39 out of the 64 counties in the State. The 2030 population estimate is expected to be 17,000 or an 82% increase from 2000. Although Clear Creek County has seen out migration the last five years, the net in migration result has been positive in terms of population growth. The aging baby boomers and retirees and smaller "gen x" and "gen y" populations will increase the average age of our population. This change in demographics will impact how we do business and our market strategy.</p>						
Source: DOLA						
Jobs						
<p>Total jobs in 2003 total 3,842, an increase from 3,128 in 1990, or a 23% increase in jobs in Clear Creek County. Tourism and the service sectors continue to dominate our job market. Employment opportunities are projected to increase by 58% by 2025. The labor force of 16+ workers was 6,166 as of 12/04. An estimated 56% of our labor force commutes to other locations to work each day. Clear Creek's unemployment rate as of 12/04 was 4.2% while the State rate was 5.1% and the US rate was 5.4%.</p>						
<p>Clear Creek County's average annual wage was \$29,861 in 2003 and up from \$22,661 in 1994. However, Clear Creek County falls well below the State average of \$38,942 and below the regional average. The range throughout the State is \$18,789 in Baca County and \$49,953 in Broomfield County. This is creating a tremendous need for attainable housing in the area to accommodate the workers.</p>						
<p>Employment trends indicate that the retail sector accounted for the most jobs in 2002 with government and the service sectors each accounting for 20% of the jobs in 2002. Mining accounted for 16% of total employment. It is anticipated that construction, retail and service sectors will drive the employment growth in the coming years.</p>						
Source: Colorado Department of Employment and Labor						
Per Capita Personal Income						
<p>In 2002 Clear Creek had a per capita personal income of \$37,276. This ranked 8th in the State and 111% of the State average, \$33,723, and 121% of the national average of \$30,905. This reflected a 0.1% increase from 2001. In 1992 the PCPI of Clear Creek was \$20,857 and ranked 13th in the State. The 1992-2002 average annual growth rate of PCPI was 6.0%, well over the State and national average.</p>						
<p>The total personal income includes net earnings including dividends, interest and rent. In 2002 Clear Creek had a total personal income of \$355,872. This ranked 31st of all counties in the State. The 1992-2002 average annual growth rate of TPI was 7.8% while the State growth rate was 7.5% and the nation was 5.2%.</p>						
Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis						
County Sales Tax						
<p>County sales tax totals (1% and excluding municipal totals) decreased 1.0% in 2004 for a year-end "received" total of \$720,682. In 1993 the County sales tax was \$486,492 which reflects an average yearly increase in sales tax of 4%.</p>						
<p>Retail trade is a major component of the local economy as it generates an important share of the County's employment, income and sales taxes. Since 1990, the County's rate of per capita sales has averaged about 40% of the regional average. In dollars, it was approximately \$12,475 in 2000 which is less than half of the region average of \$29,950. This indicates that Clear Creek does not attract significant visitor spending nor captures a significant share of their own residents spending. This also indicates that there is significant leakage of consumer spending outside of the community.</p>						
Property Taxes						
<p>Total assessed valuation decreased by over six million dollars due primarily to a temporary two-year reduction in the Henderson Mine personal property assessment. Utilities also fell in 2004 probably due to depreciation of personal property by one or more utilities.</p>						
Total AV:						
<p>2000: \$196,676,790                  2001: \$186,368,720                  2002: \$167,535,950                  2003: \$181,579,010                  2004: \$175,249,670</p>						

Source: Clear Creek County Assessor

#### Building Permits

Building permits numbered 231 in 2004, which included everything from residential to commercial and roofs, decks and new home construction. However, this represents a 24% decrease in permits from 2003.

Source: Clear Creek County

#### Housing

Total housing units in Clear Creek County in 2003 totaled 5,316 with persons per household averaging 2.31. The vacancy rate was 21.80%. The Division of Housing housing cost projections estimated on January 1, 2002 indicate that the average price per square foot to be \$188.22. The projected value of a 1,300 sq/ft home was \$235,962 while a 2,000 sq/ft home was projected to be \$363,019. Second homes make up about 22% of the County housing.

Source: Colorado Division of Housing

#### Tourism

Travel spending on Clear Creek County's economy was \$22.1M in 2003, up from \$18.7M in 1997. Tourism jobs totaled 340 in 2003, slightly down during the last five years. Travel spending generated over \$600,000 in local taxes in 2003 and almost \$1M in State taxes.

Source: Runyan Tourism Report

#### Economic Issues Relating to the Draft PEIS

- The majority of CDOT's preferred alternatives call for a 15-year construction period with the majority of the construction occurring in Clear Creek County.
- Economic impacts during this 15 year construction period could include the loss of sales tax revenues, property values, lengthened commuter times, decrease value of time, loss of population, and public education funding.
- CDOT's economic analysis pools the outputs for the nine counties...this really confuses the results for the individual counties and it is not evident in Tier 1 what the economic impacts will be on Clear Creek County. Clear Creek County asks that CDOT analyze these impacts prior to making a final decision. The economic impacts are spread among the nine counties. These impacts should be broken out county by county.
- CDOT does not capture our impacts, as they are different than other communities that rely solely on tourism. We are so close to metro Denver with 56% of our labor force commuting outside the County.
- Tourism is the focus industry exclusive of all other industries. Use another weighing variable other than tourism. Clear Creek County's relationship with I-70 is heavily influenced by commuter use. We would like to see another weighing criteria in the equation such as miles of roadway impacted by construction. Region wide tourism generates 41% of the jobs and 38% of the income. In Clear Creek County tourism accounts for 20% of the jobs and 12% of the income with commuter households bringing in the most significant economic activity accounting for 30% of all county jobs and income.
- We know that Clear Creek's fragile economy has been impacted in recent years by 9/11, drought, and gas prices. CDOT uses sales tax per capita as a regional economic perspective. This analysis shows that Clear Creek County's rate is about 40% of the nine-county region. The County is 30 minutes from Denver and differs because of this factor. The statewide average should be used instead of the regional approach. CDOT shows a depressed rate of growth during the construction. Not only will we not grow but also we could see substantial loss in our economy to where we might not recover.
- The REM model used in the economic analysis is a robust modeling system with the ability to be manipulated and induced with pre-weighting of factors. How much weight does the economic factors carry? We need to lobby that they carry substantial weight. How is the final preferred alternative selection made?

Categorized Comment	599	Cleveland, Dick	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	May 24, 2005	Online
					<p>Cecilia Joy, Project Manager CDOT - Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy,</p> <p>Please accept our comments regarding the I-70 PEIS and the impact on recreation resources in particular.</p> <p>Our group represents the citizens of the six towns of the Eagle River Valley and Eagle County. Our mission, as accurately captured in the PEIS text on page 3.14-8, is to create a regional trail system (paved) that connects local communities through the Eagle River Valley from Vail to Glenwood Canyon.</p> <p>Table 3.14-3 notes that the Minimal Action Alternative, Highway Alternative and Combination Alternative will all have an impact on the "Vail Trail" in the Dowd Junction area and on the Vail Pass-Tenmile National Recreation Trail.</p> <p>Regarding Dowd Junction (MP 171), significant local investment has been made in the trail through that area due to terrain challenges. Our request is that design and construction of highway curve realignments include no disruption of use on that trail segment due to construction. Many people have come to depend on that trail as a safe three-season alternative route between communities.</p> <p>Regarding the Vail Pass-Tenmile Trail, the trail has become a facility of statewide importance since built in the 1970's. It is seriously damaged in the location of the proposed climbing lanes project because of sand, salt, plowing and drainage impacts.</p> <p>Our request, on behalf of the citizens and visitors to our state that use the facility, is that the damaged and substandard sections of trail be rebuilt to current specifications with greater separation from the interstate which will increase the durability and lifespan of the facility. This work should be accomplished prior to the construction of the climbing lanes project to avoid closure of the Recreation Trail which would have a negative economic impact on the communities connected by the trail. The design and permitting work could occur as part of, or precede, the process for the climbing lane projects. While CDOT has expended some energy these last three years to repair and mitigate damage to the trail, it is unavoidable that it requires some focused reconstruction 30 years after it was originally built.</p> <p>Thank you for incorporating these comments into the final decision document.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dick Cleveland, Chairman ECO Eagle Valley Trails Committee</p>	
Categorized Comment	754	Cockrell, Mike	Public	5/28/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Fix the choke points (elevated roadways, re-route to reduce curves, manage demand with tolls/credits); consider another hwy from CO 285 to Summit County via South Park. Mandatory: some form of effective mass transit is included in every project proposal (not just I-70, but include the metro region). Raise gasoline taxes - not all at once but small amounts over 10 years or more. This would encourage more intelligent and thoughtful travel decisions, and would encourage efficient vehicles; it also would spur innovation in the auto industry. Use some of the tax revenue to mitigate negative effects of gas and oil exploration, retrieval, processing and effects of consumption, i.e. pollution abatement (e.g. state tax credits to gasoline producers for initiating policies and practices that are beneficial to global environment and societies where petroleum development exists; tax credits for buying efficient autos and for junking inefficient ones). Adding lanes to I-70 would be very disruptive for years, and would not solve the problems. In the short or long terms, Gas tax revenues could also be used to promote and make functional mass transit to resort areas. We're never going to 'solve' traffic problems. But using a multitude of small 'solutions' will, in the long run, help keep the situation manageable. Finally, we must begin to understand the truth about population: the whole world can't live in Colorado; discourage development of immense suburbs which rely on the auto. Slow permits for wells and refuse trans-basin water diversions -- they only add to the problem of too many people in the state. Un-American you say? So what's your point? Mike Cockrell 432 Cascade Cir. Silverthorne, CO cockrell@colorado.net</p>	Written

Categorized Comment	26	Cohen, Warren	Public	1/10/2005	<p>Highway Department DOA when it comes to managing traffic on the I-70 Mountain Corridor. I-70 is the lifeline to the bulk of the tourist economy in the State of Colorado. There are times when this link is overwhelmed by traffic beyond its capacity. Having a home in both Denver and Vail I have experienced many of these times. The excess volume is as a result of weekend traffic, specifically west bound on Friday evening and east bound on Saturday and Sunday nights and Monday morning. This is compounded by the weather conditions.</p> <p>It has been my experience that the CDOT does nothing different to manage the traffic during these critical times. In fact I am hard pressed to ever even see highway patrol people out in these situations. I think the solution is simple. First, there has to be enforcement of the law that vehicles in the left lane need to be passing or they should be ticketed. Second, during the high volume hours in bad weather, large commercial vehicles should not be allowed over Vail Pass or on the East bound approach to the Eisenhower Tunnel. Further, there should be a punitive penalty for those vehicles that impede traffic. This would be as a result of either road hogging, lack of adequate equipment (snow tires, etc.), left lane slow driving, etc. Third, there needs to be active management of the traffic during these time slots. Patrol people should be posted at set stations to monitor the flow of traffic. They should not be there to give out speeding tickets, but should be there to observe the weather conditions and the flow of the traffic, communication this to a central station. If a problem occurs, there should be a response mechanism to focus on fixing the problem as soon as possible.</p> <p>I am not optimistic. From my experience, CDOT is the most arrogant, defensive, under achieving department is the State. They will not think out of the box or try anything creative to get the job done. In my opinion they need to reinvent this department.</p> <p>What I fear is that they will impose a very expensive solution that will feather their bed, probably a huge construction project, which in the end will give us the same end result: one or two vehicles that will clog up the corridor at any give moment.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	655	National Trust for Historic Preservation	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/20/2005	<p>Mountains/Plains Office National Trust for Historic Preservation 535 16th Street, Suite 750 Denver, CO 80202</p> <p>May 20, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager CDOT Region 1 18500 East Colfax Ave. Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Re: DPEIS Comment Letter for I- 70 Mountain Corridor</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>On behalf of the National Trust for Historic Preservation (National Trust), we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft PEIS for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a private, nonprofit membership organization dedicated to protecting the irreplaceable. Recipient of the National Humanities Medal, the Trust was founded in 1949 and provides leadership, education, advocacy, and resources to save America's diverse historic places and revitalize communities. See 16 U.S.C. § 468. The Mountains/Plains Office in Denver provides technical assistance to eight states, including Colorado. With the strong support of our 270,000 members around the country, including nearly 3,000 members in Colorado, the National Trust works to protect significant historic sites and to advocate historic preservation as a fundamental value in programs and policies at all levels of government. For this project, we are recognized as a consulting party under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and have participated in many consulting party meetings throughout this process.</p> <p>Our concerns include potential effects on historic properties and communities in the corridor, particularly the Georgetown/Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District and the National Register District of Idaho Springs. We are also concerned about the impacts of the project on heritage tourism in the area, which is the backbone of the local economy. Since these communities lost numerous historic buildings and community character when the original corridor was constructed 40 years ago, it is imperative to minimize additional hardships on these towns.</p> <p>We are also troubled by CDOT's dismissal of certain alternatives preferred by the communities along the corridor. There is a fundamental conflict between CDOT's support for a widening alternative and the vision of local communities for a less destructive alternative that will remedy problems at key choke points, while leaving transit options available for the future. Our specific concerns are:</p> <p>I. Indirect effects, including noise and visual impacts, induced growth and economic effects, will negatively impact the historic communities in the corridor. We agree that much of the damage caused to the historic I-70 communities occurred in the late 1950s, before NEPA and NHPA were enacted to prevent such wide-spread damage to community character. Therefore, we are less worried about direct takings of historic buildings, since the alternatives include only the possibility of moving the Toll House (a previously moved building) and no other direct effects to historic buildings. Rather, we believe the following issues merit more adequate consideration in the final PEIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Noise: Depending on the alternative selected, traffic noise will increase in the historic communities, adversely affecting the setting of these mountain towns. For example, the experience and attraction of walking and shopping in the Idaho Springs National Register District or visiting a museum in Georgetown will be degraded if traffic noise substantially increases.</li> <li>o Visual: Depending on the alternative selected, there are a variety of potential visual effects on historic buildings. The most severe appears to be the introduction of an elevated roadway through Idaho Springs. For the two highway widening alternatives, the DPEIS shows three elevated travel lanes looming over the town and introduces an extraordinarily intrusive new element into the landscape and between downtown and the canyon wall. In addition to the potential visual change from the towns, there is also likely to be a change to the driver experience from the interstate, where views into Colorado's historic mining communities could be blocked or altered.</li> <li>o Induced Traffic and Development: We also believe that the widening alternatives in particular will increase capacity and traffic, leading to more development, particularly around interchanges. This growth will continue to threaten the character of the historic communities along the corridor, through the introduction of additional sprawl development at the edge of the historic towns.</li> <li>o Economic Effects from Construction: The extended construction period (15 years for the widening alternatives) will have negative consequences for the economies of the historic communities. Nearly all traffic into the communities comes via I-70 and the long construction period will likely deter tourist traffic, which is crucial to the economies of these historic towns. The DPEIS claims that this project is being done in part to promote tourism by efficiently getting more tourists to the historic communities. DPEIS at ES-1. Yet the construction period has the possibility of negatively affecting the communities' economies to the extent that, after 15 years, many businesses will have closed and there will be fewer reasons for tourists to visit. The highway widening alternatives will "probably entail the greatest degree of construction impacts for local communities along the route." DPEIS at 3.9-20. The DPEIS does not provide adequate information to determine whether the adverse effects of construction impacts can be successfully mitigated, since the document merely states that CDOT will "[d]evelop information systems...to inform affected communities, I-70 travelers, businesses, and homeowners about construction activities and schedules." DPEIS at 3.19.2.7</li> </ul> <p>II. Moderate and reasonable alternatives have not received sufficient consideration in the DPEIS and CDOT has not taken into account the views of the I-70 communities. It appears that only widening alternatives have been seriously considered by CDOT. In contrast, the alternatives preferred by the I-70 communities have not received adequate consideration, and some solutions—such as Intelligent Transportation Systems that are being developed by other DOTs like Caltrans—have received no consideration at all. In fact, while 21 alternatives are proposed in the DPEIS, both the DPEIS document and CDOT's presentation at public meetings have so clearly supported the highway widening alternatives (either the Six-Lane Highway 55 mph or 65 mph), that questions arise about whether an alternative has already been selected prior to completion of the NEP A process.</p> <p>The Purpose and Need statement for the project states that "respect for community values" will be provided for and accommodated in the project. DPEIS at ES-1. We attended a number of the public meetings on the DPEIS and did not hear anyone, among the hundreds of people testifying, support the widening alternatives. Local governments, other Section 106 Consulting Parties, community organizations and state legislators have recently spoken out against a 6-lane widening alternative and in favor of the "minimal action alternative with some additional action items." Coalition to CDOT: Transit is a Must, and Fix the Chokepoints, Summit Daily News, May 9, 2005. It is incumbent on CDOT to take into account more seriously the views of the corridor communities and acknowledge that widening would not "respect community values."</p> <p>III. The DPEIS does not take a sufficiently long-term view of the issues along the corridor. In 1998 the MIS for the corridor identified the need for transit options (particularly fixed guideway) and developed 50-year, long-term vision. While the DPEIS is supposed to "determine the reasonableness of alternatives in terms of affordability," it instead seems to disregard the recommendations of the MIS completely. DPEIS at ES-1. Furthermore, the DPEIS states that, when completed, the project's useful life will be over. It seems absurd to begin a major project knowing full-well that in 2025 the exact same problems will exist in the corridor. In essence, this is repeating the same mistake that was made when the road was designed and constructed in the late 1950s and the long-term corridor future was considered. We believe that one way to remedy this problem would be to expand the scope of the project beyond 2025. The need for a longer-term view supports a transit solution, and consideration of Intelligent Transportation Systems, instead of returning to the knee-jerk response of widening—an approach that simply will not provide a long-term remedy for the corridor's problems. If widening will only gain 20 more years of functionality, what alternatives can meet or exceed the corridor needs</p>	Written



looking forward to 2050, or even 2100? Especially in times of uncertainty about the future price and availability of oil, we believe it would make sense to more fully explore alternatives to widening highways for more automobile traffic.

IV. The analysis of the project's financial considerations is flawed. The DPEIS states that a \$4 billion threshold is defined as "economically feasible." DPEIS at ES-2. There is no basis for the determination of this number and we question how that is economically feasible, since currently available project funding has only been identified for the minimal action alternative and no others. We believe that the lack of available funding also supports the need to select a more moderate alternative. In other areas, such as the cost of the Advanced Guideway System versus widening, the document appears to compare apples to oranges. For example, it appears that the \$6.15 billion cost of AGS will provide 118 miles of transit service (\$52 million/mile), but the \$2.14-2.65 billion for either six-lane widening alternative (\$53.5-66 million/mile) will only achieve 40 miles of road improvements. Comparison of a per-mile cost would fairly illustrate the relative costs. Securing adequate project funding will likely require the financial support of Colorado citizens and taxpayers, whose support for widening alternatives is currently absent.

V. The Tiered Analysis Improperly Defers Consideration of Effects on Historic Properties. Finally, we understand from the DPEIS that a complete analysis of historic properties identified and included in the 4(f) chapter of the document cannot be carried out in Tier I because no specific alternative has been identified, and therefore specific effects are unknown. However, this raises the risk that, in Tier I, alternatives that could be least harmful to the 11 identified historic properties may be eliminated prematurely, and would then be unavailable for further analysis in Tier II. When all alternatives lie within the same corridor, there is no reason for deferring the consideration of effects on historic properties. (In contrast to projects involving multiple alternative corridors.) In fact, deferring this consideration could have the effect of foreclosing alternatives that could avoid, minimize, or mitigate harm to historic properties.

In summary, we feel that the final PEIS should select a moderate alternative that minimizes indirect effects on the historic communities, that respects the corridor communities' views, and is reasonable in terms of both long-term vision and public investment.

Thank you for considering the views of the National Trust.

Sincerely,  
Amy Cole  
Sr. Program Officer & Regional Attorney

Cc: Georgianna Contiguglia, SHPO, Colorado Historical Society  
Mark Rodman, Executive Director, Colorado Preservation, Inc.  
Dana Abrahamson, Historic Georgetown  
Robert Bowland, Historical Society of Idaho Springs  
Lee Behrens, Chairman, Georgetown Silver Plume Historic District  
Mill Creek Valley Historical Society  
Janine Weeds, Town of Silver Plume  
Cindy Neely, Town of Georgetown  
Julie Holmes, Idaho Springs Historic Preservation Commission  
Lysa Wegman-French, NPS  
Mary Ann Naber, FHWA FPO  
Carol Legard, ACHP  
Congressman Mark Udall  
Senator Ken Salazar  
Senator Wayne Allard

Categorized Comment	660	Community United Church of Christ	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/22/2005	<p>COMMUNITY UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST 2650 TABLE MESA DRIVE BOULDER, COLORADO 80305</p> <p>May 22, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228 Re: Interstate 70 Mountain Corridor Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy and Ms. Wallace:</p> <p>The undersigned members of the Community United Church of Christ provide the following comments regarding the Interstate 70 Mountain Corridor Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS"). We believe that the EIS fails to adequately consider environmentally and socially superior alternatives, including the Advanced Guideway System and more modest de-bottlenecking of highways in Clear Creek County. CDOT and FHWA should revise the EIS and pursue options that will better protect quality of life, the environment and our long-term transportation future.</p> <p>The proposed highway-only alternatives will cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- massive disruption to the historic communities along the corridor;</li> <li>- impacts to aquatic and terrestrial wildlife;</li> <li>- destruction of scenic vistas along the corridor;</li> <li>- further deterioration of water quality;</li> <li>- great disruption to traffic and businesses during the long construction process;</li> <li>- immense damage to the State economy during the period of construction, which will deter tourism and ski trips; and</li> <li>- a need to develop further transportation projects as soon as highway work complete.</li> </ul> <p>Construction of six lanes along the entire corridor is an expedient that is inconsistent with the quality of life and values we share as Coloradans, is unjust to those who live in the corridor and unreasonably destroys natural and historic resources. At the same time, it lacks vision regarding our future, since it will not provide needed long-term mobility for the State. The people of Colorado, including future generations, deserve far better than this.</p> <p>We disagree that CDOT has demonstrated that a monorail or more limited highway improvements are infeasible, and find that these alternatives would be superior for the State's long-term future and less destructive of our resources. These options could be feasible through a number of financing mechanisms, including the Regional Transportation Authority bill recently passed by the Legislature. Please provide leadership for a transportation solution that we can all be proud of instead of another inadequate, destructive and expensive highway plan.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	Written
---------------------	-----	-----------------------------------	--	-----------	---	---------

Categorized Comment	653	Colorado Historical Society	State Agencies	5/19/2005	<p>Colorado Historical Society The Colorado History Museum 1300 Broadway Denver, Colorado 80203-2137</p> <p>May 19, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Jean Wallace, P.E. Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Re: 1-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. (CHS #30918)</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy and Ms. Wallace:</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the I-70 Mountain Corridor project. Due to the length of our letter, we have provided a summary outline of our comments.</p> <p>I. SHPO SHOULD BE CONSULTED ON THE RELATIVE EFFECTS OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES PURSUANT TO SECTION 106 Page 3</p> <p>II. COMMENTS ON THE DPEIS Page 4</p> <p>A. COMMENTS ON THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: SHPO HAS QUESTIONS REGARDING HOW THE</p>	Written
---------------------	-----	-----------------------------	----------------	-----------	--	---------

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS INVOLVING HISTORIC PROPERTIES WERE ADEQUATELY CONSIDERED** Page 4

- We believe that the FHWA and CDOT may not have considered in Tier 1 the effect of all alternatives on historic properties in the manner required by FHWA regulations.
- FHWA's and CDOT's reliance solely upon economic affordability in choosing preferred alternatives is contrary to NEPA and FHWA regulations.
- Please provide a clear justification for the \$4 billion cost ceiling.
- Under Section 106, please provide a discussion on the potential relative effect of a change in land use.
- The selection of preferred alternatives should not from a practical standpoint prejudice consideration of other alternatives.

**B. COMMENTS ON CHAPTER 1, PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION** Page 6

- Section 1.1: Summary Purpose and Need Statement. The summary purpose and need statement should include environmental factors.

**C. COMMENTS ON CHAPTER 3, AFFECTED ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES** Page 6

- Section 3.15: Historic Properties and Native American Consultation. Consultation for historic properties has not been accomplished pursuant to Section 106.
- Section 3.16 Section 4(f) Evaluation. The Section 4(f) analysis addresses direct effects within the footprint of the alternatives but does not address constructive use.
- Section 3.19 Mitigation Summary. We believe that a mitigation summary should be prepared during Tier 1.

**C. COMMENTS ON CHAPTER 4, CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSIS** Page 6

- Chapter 4 does not include a discussion regarding the cumulative effects to cultural resources under Section 106.

We would like to begin our comments with a reference to the January 22, 2004 meeting held in our office with staff from Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and their project consultants regarding the role of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in the tiered (DPEIS). During that meeting we discussed the need to initiate the Section 106 process at Tier 1 because this review had been left out of the NEPA planning process. As a result of the January 2004 meeting, other Section 106 technical assistance and consulting parties' meetings have been conducted, as stipulated in Section 106. The Revised Reconnaissance Survey of the Interstate 70 Mountain Corridor, which served to identify historic resources within the Area of Potential Effect for Tier 1, was received by our office on February 10, 2005 as well as by the other consulting parties for review and comment, as stipulated in 36 CFR 800.4 of Section 106.

In our opinion, FHWA and CDOT were complying with Section 106 regulations until they made a decision not to complete an assessment of potential relative effects on the list of identified resources (36 CFR 800.5). In short we feel that the Section 106 review process has been complied with as far as the submission of the reconnaissance survey (36 CFR 800.4), but has not progressed any further. We have participated in consultation regarding a Tier 1 Programmatic Agreement (PA). As you know, we understand the goal of the PA is to inform how Section 106 studies will be completed in Tier 2. However, it is not clear how the PA will address Tier 1 assessments of relative effects under Section 106.

Section I of the following comments focuses on the issue presented in the preceding paragraph. Section II includes Colorado Historical Society's (SHPO) comments on the DPEIS.

**I. SHPO SHOULD BE CONSULTED ON THE RELATIVE EFFECTS OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES PURSUANT TO SECTION 106**

During recent consultations with our office, staff members of the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) informed us that they are not planning on completing the evaluation of the relative effects of the various alternatives pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Instead, they intend for a programmatic agreement (PA) following Tier 1 to establish the process for the evaluation of effects on historic properties under Tier 2. Although we agree that a PA is needed to establish the methodology for dealing with cultural resources in Tier 2, we feel that the PA should be informed by the evaluation of the relative effects under Section 106. In our opinion, because no determinations of relative effects have been completed under Section 106, our office has not been given an opportunity to comment on the effects, as stipulated in 36 CFR 800.4(d)(2).

Our opinion is based both upon regulations governing the Section 106 process as well as a letter dated January 26, 2005 from David A. Nicol, FHWA Division Administrator. In the letter Mr. Nicol stated that the relative effects of the alternatives on currently known historic properties would be completed at the Tier 1 level. However, no evaluation of the relative effects under Section 106 has been submitted to our office or the consulting parties for review and comment.

In addition, handouts given to consulting parties during a September 22, 2004 meeting in Silver Plume indicated that the effects assessment would be completed during Tier 1. One handout, entitled "Steps in the Section 106 Process," states that "the evaluation of effects at Tier 1 will consist of an analysis of the relative visual, noise, physical, and cumulative impacts of the different alternatives on known and potential historic properties within the APE based on current data. This information is then used as part of the evaluation of alternatives under Tier 1." Another handout included a project schedule with due dates for consultation regarding the effects analysis. However, this schedule has been replaced with a new Tier 1 schedule received in our office on March 17, 2005 addressing the completion of a Tier 1 PA but not mentioning the effects assessment.

Our review of the DPEIS leads us to feel that sufficient information may have been gathered to complete an evaluation of the relative effects of the alternatives under Section 106. Much of the information presented under the NEPA environmental studies could probably be used to conduct an evaluation of the relative effects under Section 106 in Tier I. Because the information appears available, it is not clear why the previously proposed evaluations of the relative effects were not completed for Section 106 and sent to our office and the consulting parties for review and comment.

**II. COMMENTS ON THE DPEIS**

**A. COMMENTS ON THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: SHPO HAS QUESTIONS REGARDING HOW THE ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS INVOLVING HISTORIC PROPERTIES WERE ADEQUATELY CONSIDERED.**

We believe that the FHWA and CDOT may not have considered in Tier 1 the effect of all alternatives on historic properties in the manner required by FHWA regulations.

Page ES-1 of the DPEIS includes the statement that "the primary purpose for conducting a tiered analysis is to determine what mode(s) of transportation will operate in the corridor from the fringes of the Denver metropolitan area to Glenwood Springs, the general alternative alignments, and the general nature of the infrastructure needed to accommodate the mode(s)." This stated purpose does not appear to be consistent with FHWA regulations requiring that "the first tier EIS would focus on broad issues such as general location, mode choice, and areawide air quality and land use implications of the major alternatives (23 CFR 771.111(g))." While the DPEIS states that the Tier 1 analysis includes an evaluation of "a host of environmental and community effects of the alternatives," the DPEIS does not explain how these factors received the same level of consideration as the primary purposes of DPEIS Tier 1 set forth in FHWA regulations.

In addition, according to 36 CFR 800.10 under Section 106 (Special Requirements for protecting National Historic Landmarks), FHWA and CDOT are required "to the maximum extent possible, undertake such planning and action as may be necessary to minimize harm to any National Historic Landmark..." It is not clear from the DPEIS how a higher standard of care was taken in evaluating the effects of the alternatives to the Georgetown-Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District. Also see Section 110(f) of the National Historic Preservation Act regarding a federal agencies responsibilities toward a National Historic Landmark.

FHWA's and CDOT's reliance solely upon economic affordability in choosing preferred alternatives is contrary to NEPA and FHWA regulations.

On Page ES-2 of the DPEIS, the preferred alternatives are defined as: "Those that best meet the underlying need and are reasonable from an economic affordability point of view." This statement appears to be inconsistent with the answer to question 4) a) of the Forty Most Asked Questions concerning Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ's) NEPA Regulations (March 16, 1981). In the CEQ document, an agency's preferred alternative is defined as "the alternative which the agency believes would fulfill its statutory mission and responsibilities, giving consideration to economic, environmental, technical, and other factors." We feel that the DPEIS criteria for the preferred alternatives omit the CEQ-mandated consideration of environmental and other factors, such as cultural resources. Therefore, we need to inquire whether the environmental, technical, and other factors as described in the CEQ guidelines were given the same consideration in the evaluation of the preferred alternatives as the economic affordability of the alternative.

To provide an example in which environmental factors were specifically considered we point you to the I-69 tiered EIS completed in July 2002 by the Indiana DOT and FHWA. In that case, the alternatives eliminated met one of two requirements: (1) alternatives that were not preferred for environmental reasons; and (2) alternatives that were not preferred because of their poor performance in meeting the goals of the project (pg. S-33 of the Summary of the I-69 Final Environmental Impact Statement). It appears that a similar type of analysis was not used for the I-70 Mountain Corridor project.

Also on Page ES-2 of the DPEIS, FHWA and CDOT conclude that the preferred alternatives were chosen using CEQ guidance by including only "those that are practical or feasible from the technical economic standpoint, and using common sense, rather than simply desirable from the standpoint of the applicant." However, additional guidance on the determination of reasonable alternatives offered by FHWA states that "more typically, costs and economic viability are considered along with other factors in determining the reasonableness of alternatives. (Federal Highway Administration Memorandum from D.J. Gribbin, Chief Counsel (HCC-I) thru David Nicol, Division Administrator (HAD-CO) to Peggy Catlin, Deputy Executive Director CDOT, dated October 15, 2004). We recommend that a re-evaluation of the alternatives include the FHWA-recommended guidance of considering, along with costs and economic viability, other factors in determining the preferred alternatives.

Please provide a clear justification for the \$4 billion cost ceiling. On Page ES-23 of the DPEIS, under the "Cost Comparisons" subheading, the DPEIS states that the Colorado Transportation Commission has committed \$1.6 billion to the I-70 Mountain Corridor project. In addition, a total of \$4 billion has been set as a cost ceiling for evaluating alternatives. The DPEIS does not include a justification for setting the reasonableness threshold at \$4 billion. If cost is the primary factor in determining the reasonableness of the alternatives as proposed, a clear justification for the \$4 billion cap is needed in order to understand the selection of the preferred alternatives. SHPO and consulting parties have requested the basis of the \$4 billion ceiling on many occasions. On each occasion we were told that this would be included in the DPEIS. However, it is not included.

Under Section 106, please provide a discussion on the potential relative effect of a change in land use.

On Page ES-43 under the subheading "Cumulative Impacts-Historic Communities," the potential effect of a change in land use is not discussed. According to Lamar Smith, Team Leader for Training, Technology, and Technical Assistance, Office of Project Development and Environmental Review, Federal Highway Administration Headquarters (Washington, DC), a change in land use should be considered in evaluating cumulative impacts (Center for Transportation and Environment: Teleconference Series #31 Lessons Learned in Assessing Indirect and Cumulative Impacts of Transportation Projects, August 26, 2004. Found at website: <http://152.14.30.150/CTE/TechTransfer/Teleconferences/webcast.aspx?ID=31>). Land use patterns are an important component of historic settings within the I-70 corridor.

In addition, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) has published guidance regarding the relationship between highway projects and cultural resources that may not have been followed. According to the ACHP, "highway construction clearly has the potential to affect historic properties in the area or areas the highway traverses, as well as in the immediate right-of-way. If it can reasonably be anticipated that the highway, once built, will cause or accelerate changes in land use or traffic patterns in other areas, these changes are also potential adverse effects of the undertaking (pg. 48, The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Section 106 Essentials: 2004 Participant's Handbook)." The selection of preferred alternatives should not from a practical standpoint prejudice consideration of other alternatives.

Page ES-47 of the DPEIS reiterates the statement that reasonable alternatives include "those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint." However, CEQ guidelines provide that reasonable alternatives, should in addition to meeting project objectives and resolving need, alleviate potentially significant impacts to important resources. The CEQ is also quite clear that agencies should not limit their list of alternatives to those that are less expensive, easy, or the agency's favorite approach. According to the CEQ, potential reasonable alternatives should also be evaluated to see if they meet the NEPA requirements of Title 1, Section 101, which stresses the importance of preserving historic, cultural, and natural resources as well as achieving a balance between population, economic growth and resource use (40 CFR 1502.2(d)).

We would like to provide an example from an I-70 project in Missouri. A guidance memorandum written by Frederick Skaer, Director of the Office of NEPA Facilitation/FHWA, dated June 18, 2001 was provided to the Missouri Department of Transportation regarding a tiered EIS project for I-70 from Kansas City to St. Louis. On the second page of the memorandum, Mr. Skaer provides guidance on establishing a tiered process. He emphasizes that preferred alternatives should not from a practical standpoint restrict consideration of alternatives for other alternatives. According to Mr. Skaer:

"The heart of the test's third part is focused on avoiding undesirable outcomes on other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements, rather than simply preserving the ability to consider alternatives in the abstract. With that in mind, we recommend that you pay specific attention in the first tier of analysis to structuring the decision-making so that the first tier strategic choices made concerning an improvement strategy for I-70 in its entirety not restrict the second tier location and design decisions to alternatives, which have highly undesirable consequences, such as unusually severe impacts to communities or the natural environment that might have been avoided with a different first tier strategy."

Mr. Skaer also conveys his concern that Tier 1 studies should be sufficiently complete to prevent compromising important resources during the selection of the preferred alternatives.

#### B. COMMENTS ON CHAPTER 1, PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

Section 1.1: Summary Purpose and Need Statement. The summary purpose and need statement should include environmental factors.

According to the DPEIS, the Colorado project's purpose and need statement is "to increase capacity, improve accessibility and mobility, and decrease congestion." On the contrary, the Missouri I-70 project's purpose and need statement was "to provide a safe, efficient, environmentally sound and cost-effective transportation facility that responds to the needs of the Study Corridor in addition to the expectations of a nationally important interstate (Final First Tier Environmental Impact Statement, October 29, 2001)." It appears that no consideration of environmental factors was made in the need and purpose statement for the DPEIS.

#### C. COMMENTS ON CHAPTER 3, AFFECTED ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Section 3.15: Historic Properties and Native American Consultation  
For historic properties, consultation has not been fully accomplished pursuant to Section 106.

Throughout Chapter 3 of the DPEIS, references are made to evaluations of effects on historic resources under Section 106. However, in our opinion, the evaluations did not involve consultation with our office and the other consulting parties. It is not clear in Chapter 3 which studies refer to NEPA evaluations and which evaluations were made pursuant to Section 106.

Geologic Hazards: On page 3.7-13, Table 3.7-2 lists the geological conditions and severity of the proposed alternatives. Some of the highway widening and transit alternatives appear to pose the greatest geologic hazards. The chapter does not address why these alternatives were selected as preferred when they appear to have severe geological hazards. In addition, for several of the highway widening alternatives, the section states that a tunnel "would avoid many of the geologic hazard areas." According to the Table 3.7-1, the geologic condition at the Georgetown Hill/Incline is characterized as ranging from low to severe. The DPEIS is not clear whether a tunnel at the Georgetown Hill/Incline was considered to avoid the geologic hazards in that area.

Noise Evaluations: On page 3.15-3 the DPEIS text states: "Although there are no specific noise guidelines or regulations pertaining to historic properties, the standard noise abatement criteria would apply. These would require that mitigation be considered for receptors when the Leq exceeds 66 dB(A)...., or when predicted noise levels for future conditions exceed the existing noise levels by 10 dB(A) or more." Similar language is included in the text on page 3.15-4: "Because there are no established noise evaluation criteria for historic properties under Section 106 regulations....FHWA noise abatement criteria and CDOT Noise Analysis and Abatement Guidelines have been adopted." We feel that these statements are not accurate for Section 106 consultation and contradict both the language cited under 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(v) as well as DPEIS text on page 3.15-4 which correctly describes the evaluation criteria used to determine the potential effects of noise to historic properties. Section 106 does require evaluation of effects caused by the "introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features." This evaluation should be carried out by the lead agency in consultation with the SHPO and other consulting parties. Neither the SHPO nor the other consulting parties have been consulted with, nor do they concur with the use of FHWA noise abatement criteria or CDOT Noise Analysis and Abatement Guidelines. Therefore, use of these standards for the evaluation of noise under Section 106 without consulting the SHPO and other consulting parties is inappropriate. We request that you initiate consultation regarding this matter with our office and the consulting parties.

Assessment of direct and indirect effects: On page 3.15-3 the DPEIS states that potential direct and indirect effects were assessed at the Tier 1 level for historic properties located within the APE. Again, as previously stated, these evaluations were done without consultation with our office or other consulting parties. Therefore, we are unable to concur with the findings as presented within the Section 106 analysis. In addition, we find the presentation of the environmental evaluations confusing because it is unclear whether evaluations apply to NEPA or Section 106 methodologies. In order to eliminate the confusion of the environmental evaluations, we recommend submitting to our office and other consulting parties a separate Section 106 study for the evaluation of relative effects for review and comment.

We urge you to study the Indiana I-69 tiered process for guidance. In that case, within the Tier 1

analysis, the Indiana DOT and FHWA completed a Section 106 report which evaluated the relative effects of the alternatives (please refer to the I-69 project web site at <http://deis.i69indyevn.org>).

SHPO acknowledges that an agreement has been executed between FHWA and the Native American tribes.

Section 3.16: Section 4(f) Evaluation. The Section 4(f) analysis addresses direct effects within the footprint of the alternatives but does not address constructive use.

On pages 3.16-1 and 3 of the DPEIS, only the footprints of the alternatives were evaluated for the 4(f) study. Eleven properties were identified in the footprint. However, the potential of constructive use was not addressed even though the parties involved in the NEPA process agreed on a 3-mile APE for the identification of 4(f) resources. Therefore, how can one determine that there would not be a constructive use if the potential of constructive use was not addressed at Tier 1? In order to avoid the situation, in which a secondary adverse effect is greater than a direct adverse effect, we recommend that the area outside the direct footprint be evaluated in the 4(f) study as well.

In support of this recommendation we point you to 23 CFR 771.135 (Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act adopted by Congress in 1966, also 49 U.S.C. 303). This regulation states that a Section 4(f) evaluation is intended both to evaluate the potential impacts of the alternatives on Section 4(f) resources as those impacts relate to the decision to be made at Tier 1, as well as to ensure that Tier 2 opportunities to minimize harm to Section 4(f) resources are not precluded by decisions made at Tier 1.

Section 3.19: Mitigation Summary. We believe that a mitigation summary should be prepared during Tier 1.

According to FHWA and CDOT, Section 106 mitigation measures for Tier 1 will be included in the proposed PA. Again, we believe it necessary to understand the relative effects of the alternatives in Tier 1 to inform the mitigation measures in the PA. In addition, there is no mitigation proposal included pursuant to NEPA regulations for the cumulative effects to historic properties (page 3.19-13).

#### D. COMMENTS ON CHAPTER 4, CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSIS

Chapter 4 does not include a discussion regarding the cumulative effects to cultural resources under Section 106.

NEPA and Section 106 use different methodology to minimize and resolve cumulative effects to cultural resources. On page 4-33, the DPEIS states that only "historic communities" would be evaluated for cumulative impacts. This methodology does not follow the Section 106 assessment of adverse effect guidance found in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1). Under Section 106, all properties found eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places qualify for review. Section 106 defines an eligible historic district, which may be what you mean by the term "historic community," as a property. This evaluation of the cumulative effects should be done in consultation with our office and consulting parties, as with the direct and indirect effects, under Section 106.

On page 4-35 of the DPEIS, the primary indicator of visual cumulative impacts is defined as the project/setting contrast—a NEPA standard. However, evaluation of the historic setting under Section 106 is not based on the project/setting contrast, although it can be considered. The primary question in evaluating historic setting under Section 106 is whether the project significantly diminishes the character-defining features of the historic settings of an individual resource or a historic district. In our opinion no Section 106 evaluation of the relative effects has been completed.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. We would like very much to sit down with you and discuss the issues in this letter. You may contact Amy Pallante, our Section 106 Compliance Coordinator, at (303) 866-4678 or Dan Corson, our Intergovernmental Services Director, at (303) 866-2673 to schedule such a meeting.

Sincerely,  
Georgianna Contiguglia  
State Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Robert T. Bowland/The Historical Society of Idaho Springs  
Dana K. Abrahamson/Historic Georgetown  
Lee Behrens/Georgetown Silver Plume Historic District  
Board of Directors/Mill Creek Valley Historical Society  
Janine Weeds/Town of Silver Plume  
Cynthia Neely/Town of Georgetown  
Julie Holmes/Idaho Springs Historic Preservation Commission  
Lisa Schoch/CDOT  
Carol Legard/Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Categorized Comment	103	Colorado Historical Society	State Agencies	1/19/2005	The Colorado History Museum 1300 Broadway Denver, Colorado 80203-2137 January 19, 2005  Cecelia Joy Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Aurora, CO 80011  Jean Wallace, P.E. Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228  Re: 1-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.  Dear Ms. Joy and Ms. Wallace,  Thank you for the submission of the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS) received by our office on November 30, 2004. According to the cover letter, a 90 day public review period ending March 10, 2005 has been set for the project. Local government officials and the public have expressed concerns to our office that the 90-day review period is not enough time to fully review and comment on the two volumes of narrative and technical information. After an initial review of the DPEIS by our staff, we concur with the comments that the 90-day review period is not long enough to fully digest all the information and prepare detailed review comments. We ask that the 90-day review period be extended so that the public, local government officials, and the appropriate resource agencies are provided adequate time to fully review and comment on the DPEIS.  If we may be of further assistance, please contact Amy Pallante, our Section 106 Compliance Coordinator, at (303) 866-4678.  Sincerely, Georgianna Contiguglia State Historic Preservation Officer	Written
Categorized Comment	738	Conway, Judy	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action - fix 'choke' points, modify travel demand (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  Any 'expansion' is an 'old think' knee-jerk response to a limited problem that occurs in a predictable westend 'time window'. Historically, MORE has never eliminated the problem—it increases it over time. We need to look at 'behavior modification' instead of this CALIFORNIA approach, and offer real well thought out long term ALTERNATIVES! Has the freeway proliferation in California SOLVED their transportation and 'quality of life' issues...NO, NO and NO! Judith Conway 259 Snowshoe Circle Breckenridge, CO 80424 jconway03@msn.com	Written
Categorized Comment	755	Cook, Nancy	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion), No action (but continue \$532 million in already planned improvements)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  More traffic allowed in corridor=more ridiculous growth for our area. People will learn to adjust, out of necessity, from Fri/Sun driving times to different times of the week and year. I-70 is only a problem during peak times.	Written

Categorized Comment	60	Cook, Rebecca	Public	1/12/2005	<p>I am a Clear Creek County resident since 1978. I have 3 children that have or are attending Clear Creek schools. We use I-70 on a regular basis, especially during ski season.</p> <p>It seems obvious to our family and most residents we talk to that a long-term (i.e. 50+ years) is the only solution worth considering. Highway widening is short sighted and ineffective: 6 lanes just means 6 lanes of traffic and potential accidents. A rail, monorail, AGS would benefit Colorado into the future without the immediate disruption of highway construction and without the obsolete result.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	507	Cook, Rebecca	Public	5/16/2005	<p>We need a long term solution to the I70 corridor congestion. More highways lanes are NOT the answer. There needs to be a vision for the future and MASS TRANSIT is the only true solution. More highway lanes means more congestion, more accidents, more loss of life, more pollution and destruction of our mountain environment, to say nothing of the years of construction and economic upheaval within the I70 towns.</p> <p>Putting people in trains or monorails provides safer transportation with less negative impact on our communities and natural environment.It's the only logical way to address the long-term challenge of moving great numbers of people from a large population center to multiple destinations. It can be done. It's been done all over the world in mountainous terrains and has helped preserve the nature and lifestyle of communities around the globe for many years.</p> <p>It's time for Colorado to take a stand to protect our beauty and our heritage and to provide a safe and enjoyable option for visitors and locals alike.</p> <p>NO TO HIGHWAY EXPANSION! YES TO TRAINS/MONORAILS!</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	366	Cook, Rebecca	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Hi. My name is Becky Cook. I'm a Clear Creek County resident, and I'm here tonight because my 14-year-old son wanted to be here tonight. He said, "Can I come to this meeting? Can I talk?" And then he decided he better do his homework. So I'm here to ask his question. He says, "Well, I'm almost 16, and if they build this highway, I'll be in my 30s by the time it's done."</p> <p>I just have a few comments from my heart. I'll leave the technical questions and the academic questions to other people here. But my concerns -- my first one is safety. As a mother of three children that think that they were born to ski, they're on that highway every weekend from the beginning to the very end of ski season. The thought of more lanes to me just means more danger, more traffic jams, more accidents. All it takes is one big patch of black ice and one careless driver and your life changes forever.</p> <p>My second concern is about community. I'd like to say publicly how proud I am of our Clear Creek County community. We have got people there who have worked this problem for many years and have devoted unbelievable amounts of time to study the issue and to try to come up with viable solutions that will be positive for everyone.</p> <p>I feel like the impact of highway widening would make irreparable damage to our community, to the historic districts, to the schools. We're lucky in our community to have many small, family-owned businesses that could not survive 15 years of construction cramming our highways with gridlock. I just think that, in my lifetime, my community would never be the same if we go the highway widening route.</p> <p>And my third comment is about vision. I implore the decision makers at CDOT to have a vision, to have a long-term plan so that in 50 or 100 years people can step off the monorail in our beautiful Colorado mountains and look around and say, Thank God someone had the vision to plan this for me and for my kids.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	376	Cook, Vicki	Public	2/23/2005	<p>I'm Vicki Cook. I've lived in the county for 30 years -- 35 years. We've had a business here, and we go to Denver regularly about twice a week. And there was a time that I could go to Denver and I could make ten stops easy and get back up here and still fix supper for the family at night. Due to the traffic, you don't do that now.</p> <p>But I would also go along with Doug Malkan and agree that we need the six lanes, and we also need to have the -- a transit of some type, a bus transit or the AGS transit, either one of those. Because by the time you do get to 2025, you're going to be looking at a whole other ball of wax to try to get straightened out.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	218	Cook, Vicki	Public	2/23/2005	<p>I've been a S.C. resident 36 years - Love it its truly beautiful. I agree with some of the comments made by the Clear Creek Cty residence. They have done some good extensive research.</p> <p>I thought the gentleman that mentioned Boreas Pass might have something but I never thought about that or how the terrain would be.</p> <p>After hearing the comments I agree we have 6 lands and another mode of transporting people. Maybe so it wouldn't be such a big impact on Idaho Springs and that area leave it until last. What about a tunnel in that area that wouldn't even affect the residents. I'm here for another 5-8 years and then I'm out of here. I do hope your choice is a choice for most of the people that will be effected the most or long time. I-70 through the Rockies is a challenge but Glenwood Canyon proves you can do it and do it right.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	674	Cooper, Albert	Public	5/24/2005	<p>STATE OF COLORADO, D. O. T. M.S. JEAN WALLACE, P.E. FHA 12300 WEST DAKOTA AVE. LAKEWOOD, COLORADO 80228</p> <p>5/24/05</p> <p>REF: I-70 CORRIDOR</p> <p>PLEASE EXCUSE THE LATENESS OF MY SUBMITAL. SINCE MY ATTENDING THE FEBUARY MEETING IN SOUTH-EAST DENVER I'VE HAD SOME MEDICAL PROBLEMS THAT HAVE SLOWED ME DOWN.</p> <p>I NOTE THE INCLUDED AREA IS WITHIN THE COPPER MOUNTAIN SKI AREA ON THE WEST AND THE LOVELAND SKI AREA ON THE EAST. THE NORTHERN EXTENT OF THE STUDY IS THE STEAMBOAT SKI AREA AND THE AREA TO THE SOUTH IS THE BRECKENRIDGE SKI AREA.</p> <p>FURTHER, THERE ARE LITTLE INPUTS FROM OTHER AREAS OUTSIDE OF THE INCLUDED AREA.</p> <p>SEEMS THIS WHOLE I-70 MOUNTAIN CORRIDOR DRAFT IS JUST FOR THE WEALTHY OF THE EASTERN SLOPE AND DOES NOT INCLUDE THE OTHER AREAS NOR THEIR NEARBY SKI AREAS. ANOTHER WAY TO PUT IT IS THAT THOSE OUTSIDE DONT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THEMSELVES AND THEIR FAMILIES WITH ALL THE MONEY GOING TO THE I-70 AREA.</p> <p>THE D.O.T. HASNT IMPLEMENTED EASIER FIXES SUCH AS TOLLS BASED UPON THE NUMBER OF PASSENGERS, A FULL CAR TOLL WOULD BE FAR LESS THAN JUST THE DRIVER; ALLOWING "GYPSY" TRUCK LINES TO MIX FREIGHT TO INSURE FULL TRUCKS, AND A PIPE LINE OR RAIL TRANSPORTATION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS BETWEEN THE EASTERN AND WESTERN SLOPES.</p> <p>AS AN ATTACHMENT I AM INCLUDING AN ARTICLE ON THE NEW SWISS GOTTHARD RAILROAD TUNNEL, PLEASE EXCUSE MY NOTES. WHAT I THOUGHT WAS IMPORTANT WAS THE SWISS DESIRE TO BANISH MOST THROUGH TRUCKS TO ONE-HALF OF CURRENT NUMBERS BY 2009. ALSO, THE SWISS ALSO TIED UP THE MONEY AND THE DESIGN OF THE TUNNEL BY INCLUDING THE DETAILS IN THE SWISS CONSTITUTION.</p> <p>I DO NOTE THE MENTION OF THE MOFFAT TUNNEL IN SOME OF THE PROPOSED ROUTES. THERE IS A BIG BLUE BOOK IN THE GOLDEN LIBRARY THAT CAN BE CHECKED OUT--SEE LAURA IF YOU ARE INTERESTED. THE PROBLEMS WERE COSTLY AND THE GEOLOGY WAS VERY POOR--THEY NEVER DID FIND BED ROCK AT THE WEST PORTAL-- IT WAS ALL COVERED BY GLACIAL MORAINES.</p> <p>THE HISTORY OF COLORADO AND INVESTMENTS IS BOOM AND BUST IN MANY ERAS. I THINK PUTTING ALL OF OUR MONEY INTO ONE BASKET COULD BE VERY FOOLISH.</p> <p>THANK YOU AND BEST REGARDS, ALFRED COOPER JR 21888 CRESTMOOR ROAD RR/5 GOLDEN, COLORADO 80401</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	591	County, Rick	Public	5/24/2005	<p>I think the AGS system is the best option for the I-70 corridor. The Colorado department of transportation and the federal highway administration is considering widening I-70 to decrease congestion. I think the AGS is better because it is a better logical and moral solution and I just think it is the best.</p> <p>The AGS system is a more logical solution to the I-70 corridor. It would leave a smaller footprint. It will be raised up off the ground so only the pillars will touch the ground. It will cut down on the traffic flow</p>	Online

thru the I-70 corridor. People don't like to waste gas so they will ride it. It wont put out pollution like cars and buses and stuff. The AGS is magnetic so it wouldn't give off any pollution. Those are my logical reasons for why the AGS system would be a good solution to I-70.

The AGS system is a more moral solution even though it cost twice as much. It is better for the environment. It leaves less of a footprint. It is the transportation of the future. Doesn't use fossil fuel so it is better for the environment. Helps people get to other parts of the mountain. places that are not accessible to other vehicles. That is why I think the AGS system would be a good moral solution to the I-70 corridor.

Here are my feelings on the AGS system being the best for the I-70 corridor. People will ride because it is cool. It is powered by magnets so people wonder how it works so they will ride it. It is a faster way to travel. It has no traffic to impede its travel. It is a more social way to travel. A lot of people on the same train so they can met new people. Now you know my feelings on why I think the AGS system would be the best solution for the I-70 corridor.

There are a few objections to the AGS system. How would it work in weather like snow and rain. The tracks will be heated so in bad weather it will still be able to run. It coast too much. It might coast more but it will save more land, homes, and businesses on the sides of the highway. Once people get there how are they going to get to the ski resort. There will be transportation shuttles waiting at the drop point to take them to the ski resort. The objections to the AGS system are irrelevant because each objection has been answered.

I think the AGS system is the best option for the I-70 corridor. Now you know my thoughts and feelings on the AGS system and why it would be the best decision for the I-70 corridor so I hope that the Colorado department of transportation makes the right decision.

Rick county

Categorized Comment	594	County, Rick	Public	5/24/2005	Jon Esquibel Robs class Blk. 5/6	Online
					<p>I think that the AGS system should be in place of our problem. The AGS is a safer, cleaner, quieter machine. Also its not a gas running means of transportation. I feel strongly about the AGS train and more the endless possibilities. Such as, more people on one trip. Easier on highways and interstate I-70, less congestion. Less pollution like noise pollution, air pollution, water pollution.</p> <p>One good reason for this idea is more people would be traveling in the train with no pollution. Not as many cars on the road. Like on weekends and holidays when people go camping and skiing. Less congestion ion the highway. Like during rush hour. Also, fewer car accidents due to bumper-to-bumper traffic. These are some of the physical reasons, why the AGS is a good choice.</p> <p>A few other reasons are ones we cannot see, like air pollution. W/ith the AGS there's less gas pollution because the AGS is electric/magnetically powered. Even less erosion from broken down cars and loitering. Less car pollution because the people that would drive are ridding the AGS. These are some of the pollution and physical earth beauty issues.</p> <p>The cost of the AGS is pricey but we will make it up. The AGS will have a fee like the Light Rail Train but a little more. This will attract even more tourism then we get now. Our profit margarine will hit shortly after train opening. These are the cost issues and possible solutions.</p> <p>T: The AGS system is a safer, cleaner way of travel.</p> <p>O: What about the cost and what's the earliest profit?</p> <p>R: Well the cost we can handle and the profits should double the cost with in a year.</p> <p>O: Will there be many stops along the way?</p> <p>R: Yes there will be a stop at every town to the finale resting point.</p> <p>O: Will there be two trains running?</p> <p>T: Possibly but we are still studying the possibilities of that issue.</p> <p>C: the AGS is the way to go as you can see.</p> <p>Finally my personal opinion is for the AGS System for the highway. I strongly believe in this system because of its not gassed powered. Its quiet and clean and we'd make a big profit in tourism alone. This is a major thing that could impact our state economy let alone the nations from planes, trains, and gas cost to get here. Don't let this fly by the window catch it and don't let go. This is what I think should happen to help the problem on I-70.</p>	
Categorized Comment	101	Covey, Paul	Public	2/1/2005	I would love to hear more talk about a Tram/Train that would complement the already existing interstate highway. I commute 3 times a week to various mountain destinations and would appreciate a form of public transport that my help facilitate and alleviate the now cumbersome interstate travel. THANKS for taking the time to consider my input.	Online
					paul covey	
Categorized Comment	737	Crowder, Jon	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion) 2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address. I oppose widening I-70. We cannot continue the endless expansion of the highway for increasing numbers of people to flood into the Rockies. Where's the limit? Jon Crowder PO Box 492 Breckenridge, CO 80424 jon@peakrhythms.com	Written
Categorized Comment	732	Cunningham, Jim	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion) 2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address. Jim Cunningham 203 Cutty Sark Ct. Box 23385 Silverthorne, CO 80498	Written
Categorized Comment	467	Curmudgeons	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/13/2005	THE CURMUDGEONS AN EVERGREEN FORUM EVERGREEN, COLORADO, U.S.A. February 13, 2005 Ms. Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228 Re: I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS	Written

Dear Ms. Wallace,

We are a senior Evergreen, Colorado activist group that tries to promote constructive change throughout the State of Colorado. As such, we have reviewed the draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the I-70 mountain corridor. Please accept our collective comments on the studies and recommendations in this document.

1. The PEIS does not follow the recommendations of the Major Investment Study (MS) conducted on this corridor by CH2M-Hill in 1998. The MS study recommended high-speed transit service with only minor highway changes. The PEIS recommends widening the highway from Floyd Hill to the west side of the Eisenhower/Johnson Tunnel. We believe that highway widening is not the most effective means of providing adequate capacity on this congested mountain corridor.

2. In 2001, an elevated high-speed monorail was widely promoted as the best overall solution to the traffic problems on I-70 west of Denver. A consortium of international corporations that proposed building this monorail determined that the projected ridership would permit construction and operation of the system with little or no subsidy. Yet, CDOT and its study contractors failed to evaluate this specific proposal. Why not?

3. CDOT states that funds expected to be available for improvements on this corridor are inadequate to permit consideration of any transit alternative, except buses. However, CDOT made no attempt to determine if private funding for such transit systems is possible. We believe CDOT should determine what incentives would be necessary to attract private funding to improve mobility along this corridor.

4. In light of there not being a transit alternative in the preferred solution, how can the public be assured that the PEIS studies were conducted in a fair and unbiased manner when the Executive Director of CDOT clearly stated in a meeting: "CDOT does not intend to get in the transit business!"?

We believe that CDOT and FHWA must provide the public with acceptable answers to these and other questions concerning the preliminary findings in the PEIS before continuing to finalize the document and making any decisions on the best improvements for I-70 in the mountain corridor.

Sincerely,

The Curmudgeons  
303-670-5070

Categorized Comment	532	Curry, Robert	Public	5/21/2005	I believe that the best alternative is the AGS because it will do less harm to the environment. CDOT is looking at all around good solutions for the I-70 corridor project. The AGS is the best alternative because it will do less damage to the environment, it is the right thing to do, and everyone would feel bad if we killed many animals. The AGS is the best alternative for many environmental reasons. With the AGS, the environment would be safer because no chemical run-off would get into the land. The water would be cleaner for aquatic life because if the water were mucky, the fish would die. We would have better air quality and everybody could breathe better. This is one environmental reason that the AGS is the best alternative. CDOT should not only do what is right for them, but also what is right for the environment. Animals have a right to live, which is why they build national parks. There is nothing good to come from being selfish and greedy. Everyone involved should have a say in what happens by good old-fashioned voting, as it has been done for centuries. After all, we are a democracy. Everyone would feel bad if they killed innocent animals. Many animal rights activists would rally, and it would not be good for politicians. Animals would die of the pollution. When it comes down to it, it is between lives and money, and lives, even of animals are always more important than money. I believe everybody would feel bad about animals that died for no reason. I am sure that there are many arguments involving the AGS. One of them is the cost because it is higher than all of the other alternatives, but cost is of no consequence to save innocent lives. Another argument is how to get from the station to the ski slopes, but it is obvious to put some kind of shuttle system up there. In addition, if people wanted to go hiking or mountain biking, compartments could be added on. Another argument is that the AGS will be elevated and block the view of the mountains from people. A majority of the problems people have with the AGS can be fixed easily. Overall, I believe that the AGS is the best alternative because it will do less damage to the environment surrounding I-70. The AGS is the best alternative, and if you do not do it, you will destroy environments and all that goes with them. The mountains would become a barren wasteland.	Online
Categorized Comment	497	Custy, Megan	Public	5/14/2005	To whom it MAY concern: I hope that the pleas of those who oppose the widening of I-70 does not fall on deaf ears. Let's leave our children a legacy...instead of more pollution. Let us build a mass transit system that pays itself. This is one environmental reason that the AGS is the best alternative. Our consumption of fossil fuels can continue indefinitely. Someday (sooner than we think) we will be forced to change our ways. How simple that will seem with an alternative already in the works or even complete! Let's do this for ourselves and our fellow citizens. Let's build a public transportation system!	Online
Categorized Comment	646	Dahlen, Marcie	Public	5/13/2005	Cecelia Joy, Project Manager CDOT Region 1 18500 East Colfax Ave Aurora, CO 80011  Dear Ms Joy,  I am writing to ask you to PLEASE consider an alternative to widening the I70 corridor through Clear Creek County.  I have lived in eastern Clear Creek County for 23 years. Because I am a skier and hiker, as well as a citizen concerned about all of the county, not just the eastern part, I am appalled at the apparent railroading of the proposal to proceed with the widening of I70 in spite of the fact that it will take 15-20 years to complete and will be obsolete by completion date. The businesses in Klaho Springs will be so negatively impacted, that if I owned one of them, I would be looking to move elsewhere. It goes without saying that the loss of historical sites is a significant loss to the entire state.  I realize that the fixed guideway system is much more expensive, but I also know that with support of Republicans and Democrats, such a forward-looking system IS possible. What an incredible legacy for a politician to leave behind! Not only would it be a safe and fun way to get to the mountains, it would be a most unique tourist attraction! Citizens always have to pay upfront for long-term gains. This is one of them! Please consider the long-range approach.  Thank you.  Sincerely,  Marcie Dahlen	Written
Categorized Comment	607	Dale, Harry	Public	5/24/2005	I would like to fully endorse the I-70 Central Mountain Transportation Coalition's Regionally Preferred Alternative and the process that created it. I would also like to emphasize the following items.  Corridor Vision  A logical progression of improvement activities should be planned over the next 50 years including effective mitigation measures, Travel Demand and Travel System Management, Alternate Route development, Transit planning and development, Non Motorized / Greenway development, and Highway improvement components. The transportation solution identified as the outcome of the PEIS should minimize disruption through the construction period, minimize the disturbance footprint and environmental impacts and fully utilize technology and incentives to create a viable long term solution.  Corridor Jurisdiction Input  The I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS should produce a sustainable solution that supports the level of growth and development desired by Corridor Jurisdictions. Corridor growth can impact local infrastructure including local roads, schools, law enforcement, emergency services, physical and legal water supply, water treatment and sewer treatment facilities. Corridor jurisdictions need to maintain some level of local control over Corridor growth, since it will have an influence on community character and resident's quality of life well into the future. Corridor jurisdictions through the I-70 Central Mountain Transportation Coalition should be allowed a substantial voice in the transportation planning process as increased Corridor access will produce significant impacts, (many of which have been inadequately addressed in the past).  Mitigation of Past and Present Impacts  CDOT needs to implement specific mitigation measures to address incomplete or inadequate mitigation of past and current impacts from the construction and operation of I-70, prior to or in conjunction with any I-70 improvements resulting from the PEIS. Improved sediment collection, reduction of entrained dust and other air pollutants, noise reduction and visual improvements should be a priority for CDOT actions as an outcome of the PEIS.  Highway Safety	Online

The safety and welfare of the Corridor Communities' residents and visitors should be a priority concern for the implementation of highway improvements. In addition, increasing traffic incidents in the Corridor overburden local jurisdictions' emergency service resources and infrastructure and can tie up traffic in the I-70 Corridor for hours. Traffic incidents may have a greater overall impact on Corridor congestion than vehicle traffic volumes alone due to their severity and unpredictability. Decreasing traffic incidents may have greater potential for reducing congestion and delays than any single capacity expanding alternative.

#### Minimal Action Components

The Minimal Action components address the major problem areas identified in Chapter 1 of the Draft PEIS and do so at a cost that is affordable based on the Chapter 5 funding projections for the next 20 years. Combined with site specific and effective mitigation measures including innovative and context sensitive design, the Minimal Action components, in conjunction with a comprehensive transit planning effort, create the initial action for the Coalition's Preferred Alternative.

Improvement components contained in the Minimal Action Alternative will effectively address the tight curves, steep grades and outmoded interchanges in the Corridor today and can be implemented sooner, at a lower capital cost and with less construction impact than the complete six lane highway widening alternatives proposed in the Draft PEIS. These improvements address the difficult queuing problems in the Corridor today and will result in additional throughput. This will provide enhanced travel times for motorists and enhanced traffic flow to the mountain resort communities sooner than any of the preferred alternatives proposed in the PEIS.

#### Areas of Special Consideration

All Minimal Action components as outlined in the Draft PEIS were included in the Coalition's Preferred Alternative with the exception of ramp intersection improvements at Exit 239 in West Idaho Springs. Idaho Springs does not want to encourage visitor travel through the west end of town, since this is a residential and not a business area.

Relocation of the eastbound and westbound ports in Downieville is desirable. Entering and exiting Trucks on short entrance and exit ramps slow traffic and promote congestion. Westbound, (uphill) trucks leaving the port create moving road blocks and a serious pinch point as they enter I-70 at significantly lower speeds than mainline westbound traffic. Extended periods of idling trucks in and around the ports also create air quality problems in the narrow constrained Downieville canyon which creates a health concern for area residents.

The auxiliary lanes between Downieville and Empire Junction, (mp 232 to 234), should be considered in conjunction with relocating the ports. Great care needs to be taken with the construction of these auxiliary lanes to minimize the highway footprint and minimize acquisition of private property in the Lawson area. Context sensitive design should be used for the development of these auxiliary lanes.

Extending the eastbound entrance ramp at Dumont, (mp 235) to create a longer merge lane should also be included. This entrance would also be a good candidate for Ramp Metering.

- The area from East Idaho Springs to Floyd Hill, (mp 241 to 247) will require special consideration to provide an innovative and creative design to smooth curves, decrease traffic incidents, increase the highway design speed and throughput, and accommodate the bike path and frontage road. The solution will need to address the very narrow Exit 244 area, (US 6 / Kermit's Interchange) and provide room for a much needed new interchange, (minus the left lane eastbound exit and left lane westbound entrance).

The 65 mph Highway alternative Hidden Valley westbound tunnel, Floyd Hill eastbound tunnel and new Twin Tunnel south side elevated bore provide an innovative approach for additional highway capacity in this challenging area by routing mainline eastbound traffic away from the Exit 244 interchange. These improvement components make up the major portion of the Coalition's Sequence 1 highway improvements. I support these improvements and applaud the effort by CDOT and JF Sato engineers to come up with an innovative highway solution for this difficult area. I would request that if necessary, water and sewer infrastructure be provided to the homeowners living directly above the Floyd Hill Tunnel, as the operation of their well and septic systems may be affected.

Special care should also be taken to improve eastbound travel safety at the Floyd Hill interchange, (Exit 247) to mitigate poor visibility resulting from sun glare and speed differentials between exiting and non-exiting vehicles.

- The area between Georgetown and Silver Plume, (mp 228 to 226) will require auxiliary climbing and descending lanes. A cut and cover design with open sided, colonnaded lanes on the hillside that mitigates rockfall hazard, preserves a continuous bike path through the area, and avoids widening of the roadway footprint passing through Silver Plume itself and the Georgetown / Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District is required. This design is to mitigate noise, air quality, water quality, and visual impacts.

At the conclusion of each major construction segment, it will be necessary to review the Project Need, (to increase capacity, improve accessibility and mobility, and decrease congestion) and the Project Purposes, (Environmental Sensitivity, Respect for Community Values, Safety, and Ability to Implement) to understand how the completed improvements are meeting the Project objectives and if any unanticipated consequences have occurred that require additional mitigation.

#### Alternate Routes

Prior to any major I-70 Corridor construction activity, alternate route components should be considered as an effective mitigation strategy to address adverse construction impacts. The development and promotion of alternate route components will shift capacity away from the I-70 Corridor during periods of significant construction and provide a relief valve for Front Range travelers seeking destinations in Summit, Eagle and Grand Counties. Pulling Front Range traffic off I-70 during construction will also reduce Corridor congestion and delays which will benefit all Corridor communities that rely on I-70 for local mobility and their local economy.

Alternate Route components could include any of the following:

- Parallel Rail Bore to the Moffat Tunnel to facilitate increased Passenger Rail service between the Denver Metro Area, Winter Park and Grand County, (may include additional Park 'n Ride lots and Rail Stations in Arvada, Rocky Flats and Rollinsville)

A partnership with Union Pacific to provide a second Rail bore would provide a new level of redundancy for Moffat Tunnel access and allow maintenance activities with less disruption to current Rail traffic. A new single Rail bore may also be less expensive to construct than a two lane highway bore.

- Parallel Two Lane Highway Bore to the Moffat Tunnel including Highway improvements from the Denver Metro Area to Rollinsville, (tunnel could be tolled to contribute to the construction and operation expenses)

- Surface Road Improvements, (two lanes) over Boreas Pass to connect US 285 to SH 9 in Breckenridge

- Surface Road Improvements, (three lanes) to SH 9 over Hoosier Pass to better connect US 285 with I-70 (through Breckenridge)

- Surface Road Improvements, (two lanes) over Mosquito Pass to connect SH 9 with SH 91 / US 24 in the Leadville area

- New Two Lane Tunnel under Georgia Pass to connect US 285 with SH 9 north of Breckenridge (could be tolled to contribute to the construction and operation expenses)

- Extend the Four Lane section of US 285 to Fairplay

#### Aviation

Aviation improvements could benefit Colorado's Tourism industry more than I-70 improvements alone. Eagle County, Leadville and Kremmling airports offer significant potential due to their close proximity to mountain resort locations. Further development of these airports will be important to keep Colorado competitive in a challenging national and international Tourism marketplace. All airports in the region, including Aspen, Eagle County, Garfield, Kremmling and Leadville must be developed in a collaborative manner to optimize their positive contribution to the transportation system. There must be planned connectivity between the highways, transit, airports and resorts.

#### Non Motorized Corridor

The Non Motorized corridor or Greenway through Clear Creek County should be integrated into any proposed solution for I-70.

#### Mitigation Analysis

Site specific and cumulative impact analysis should be included in all proposed improvements, (alternate route, highway and transit), including the costs of the specific mitigation measures required. Mitigation analysis is an appropriate measure for Tier 1 since mitigation measures could greatly impact capital costs and the economical reasonableness of any or all alternatives.

Thank you.



Categorized Comment	725	Dale, Harry	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	154	Dale, Harry	Counties	1/12/2005	<p>Hi. My name is Harry Dale. I'm a Clear Creek County commissioner. I would like to thank Mike for stealing most of what I was going to say.</p> <p>What I'd like -- when I look around this room, I see most of the folks here in their 30s, 40s, and 50s. Our primary experience with this project is going to be the construction phase. And I think we have a lot of concern about the impacts of that construction.</p> <p>And many of us won't be recreating quite as much. As Mike pointed out, many of us won't even be around in 2025. Yet the travel time, congestion hours -- travel time and congestion hours have not been evaluated for each alternative during the 15-year construction period. I would request that that would be done so that we can make a valid comparison of alternatives during construction.</p> <p>As you know, our piece, the Clear Creek County piece and mountain corridor is very narrow and challenging, especially between Floyd Hill and Empire Junction. I can't imagine any major construction, as is proposed in all of the preferred alternatives, that would not require resources from Idaho Springs, Dumont, Downieville, Lawson, and even Silver Plume. And to make it worse, there are no detour routes available from Kermits to Hidden Valley, from Georgetown to Silver Plume, and from Bakerville to Loveland ski area. Delays have to be severe during the construction period.</p> <p>And I'll point out that they're going to be not just peak but off peak, because those that travel today to avoid the peak at off-peak times will be facing serious construction activities. And those in peak periods will be facing detours.</p> <p>Again, I would request that Tier II is too late to evaluate the mobility restrictions during the 15-year construction period because the decision on the alternative will already have been made. Please be specific on mobility restrictions, travel times. And congestion should be analyzed at the Tier I point. And I would ask for that.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	176	Dale, Harry	Public	1/15/2005	<p>Thank you. My name is Harry Dale. I am a resident of Evergreen. I am on the east part of the county and still concerned about the west end of the county.</p> <p>I wanted to give just some scope to the construction in Clear Creek County that's being proposed. All CDOT preferred alternatives are in greatest impact grouping. All highway alternatives require major reconstruction of the highway platform, from 34 miles through Clear Creek County. The bus in guideway located on-grade and in the center median would require reconstruction of the highway from Golden to Silverthorne, which is a distance of 55 miles.</p> <p>Construction impacts were described very well on pages 264 and 268, and again on 39.17 to 39.20. I urge every Denver -- Metro Denver resident and visitor that enjoys access to the mountains to read these pages. For most Colorado residents and visitors, the time frame of the construction mobility impacts of CDOT's preferred alternatives should be, at the very least, alarming.</p> <p>Each of these alternatives will aim to keep highway operation up during the construction period. However, the draft indicates that reductions in the number of lanes and temporary total closures will occur during off-peak travel periods. Even during peak periods, these alternatives will likely create lane and shoulder narrowings, transitions from old pavement to new pavement, with reduced standards and speed and convoluting of traffic through one-way stretches, all of which will add to travel times.</p> <p>The use of traffic-control devices will be expensive and will affect the speed of traffic in construction areas. Construction activity in close proximity to traffic will likely result in extended traffic interference. The residents of Clear Creek County, their visitors, businesses, and governments and other institutions, and all of the people traveling through the county will be affected by the construction work.</p> <p>CDOT has provided no viable alternative for mobility in the corridor during the construction period and basically dismisses discussion until the conclusion of a Tier-II-level study of 2010, well after a decision is made on the selected alternative. Construction in the mountain corridor is difficult and different than it might be in metro Denver or other places in the country. Since there are no viable alternative routes, no side streets, no frontage roads, no other routes, major highway reconstruction in the mountain corridor will be difficult and time-consuming. It will affect both peak and off-peak travel periods.</p> <p>Challenges will include narrow canyons, huge rock walls, excavation of enormous amounts of material, blasting additional tunnel bores, intrusive -- intrusion into watershed, rockfall, and avalanche areas, disservice of mill tailings and other heavily mineralized areas, and intrusion into private property, towns, parks, historic and landmark districts.</p> <p>I would ask that we look at -- I would ask CDOT and FHWA to consider the overriding purpose of the PEIS to be the mobility of the mountain corridor during the next 20 years in addition to the mobility in the corridor beyond the next 20 years.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	175	Dale, Jael	Public	1/15/2005	<p>My name is J.L. Dale. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I would like to start off by saying I support the monorail as an alternative. The monorail would have the least impact in the mountain corridor, which is the lifeblood of this state.</p> <p>I personally would ride the monorail. If I was sitting in traffic for hours, saw a monorail go by, you can bet your boots the next time I would take the rail. The travel time would be a welcome time to read, catch up on mail, sleep, and relax. The ride home would provide the same luxuries. For residents who kayak, mountain bike -- use the mountain bikes and fish, they would still have the option of driving the highway, but there would be one less driver on it, and that would be myself.</p> <p>I would ask that everyone in this room research the visionary plan of the monorail system which is being looked at by the states of California, Maryland, Georgia, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. The monorail is the future, not cement and asphalt. CDOT should read books by Walt Disney who was, in fact, a visionary in the 1950s. CDOT appears to be unable to avoid the tunnel vision of strictly highway solutions.</p> <p>It is obvious that CDOT and the Sato team have not taken into consideration the detrimental effect of the widening of I-70 and the effect it will have on the state's tourism economy and the counties in the corridor. How would the skiers, mountain bikers, fishermen, and all outdoor-minded people get to their destination when the road will be torn up for 15 years without a viable alternative?</p> <p>I've been in the mortgage banking industry for 24 years -- I see you -- 15 years of construction will have a huge impact on the value of our homes. They will, in fact, depreciate. Who in their right minds will want to move to an area whose major access will be under construction for 15 years? Some of us have built equity in our homes as an additional source of retirement funds. The proposed construction for the CDOT preferred alternatives will jeopardize that equity.</p> <p>15 years of construction will also jeopardize -- this is important, so please don't put that up again. Okay? 15 years of construction will also jeopardize emergency response to our homes. I guess someone having a heart attack or an accident will die for the sake of widening I-70.</p> <p>I ask all of you to look at the faces in front of you. You -- I see you. Look at the faces in front of you. Behind those faces you will find engineers, scientists, geologists, profit managers, teachers, business owners, and veterans of this United States. You will also see politicians, from all parties. There's no line drawn here for the issue. We are all here today to protect the Rocky Mountains and the current and future economy of this state.</p> <p>I'm sorry, but I'm going to finish. Thank you.</p> <p>You have failed to give the residents and the community time to review the 1,500-page document. I strongly request the members of CDOT to do the right thing and give us time to decipher this information.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	269	Dale, Jael	Public	2/2/2005	<p>Thank you. My name is J.L. Dale, and I live on Floyd Hill. Much of what I have to say this evening has already been said, but my opinion is we can't say it enough. And it's hot in here, so excuse me.</p> <p>The reality is that I-70's highway widening will produce a 15-year growth chokehold on I-70 traffic as construction moves through the corridor and strangles the Colorado ski industry. The result will be 15 years of increased congestion. This congestion will make today's peak weekend congestion seem like a good day. I'd like to understand how CDOT can state that this will provide a short-term solution. A normal two-hour drive will now be five to six hours.</p>	Transcripts

Construction in the mountain corridor is different than it might be in Denver and the metro area or other places in the county -- country. Since there are in place no viable alternative routes, no side streets, no frontage roads, no routes in Clear Creek County, there is no viable alternative to I-70 between Bakerville and the Eisenhower Tunnel, between Silver Plume and Georgetown, and between Hidden Valley and Kermits.

And I'd just like to -- in the county, there are frontage roads; however, the frontage roads carry only minimal capacity and are already clogged up during the peak I-70 travel periods.

Mr. Norton and CDOT officials will downplay the construction impact of highway widening and tout their horns stating their expertise in managing construction activity as demonstrated on I-25 during T-Rev and US 40 on Berthoud Pass. While there is no doubt that CDOT has typical experience, in this area, they do not have the experience.

The mountain corridor is a much more restricted corridor than I-25, and the I-70 traffic volumes are many times greater than US 40 at Berthoud Pass.

CDOT also does not control the drivers' behavior regardless of the construction management techniques. People, including myself, slow down when orange cones and barricades come out. They love to take their time in construction zones and monitor construction activities, usually referred to as "rubbernecking."

The PEIS will have the greatest impact to most Colorado residents and visitors in their 40s, 50s, and older. Many of these folks are baby boomers who make their primary destinations skier, condo-based, and second-home owners for the Western Slope resort communities. Those who are the major contributors to the resort area economy will find their primary experience with the I-70 PEIS during the next five years as congestion increases prior to and then during the 15-year construction period. Mobility during the next 20 years will be a crucial factor in their lifestyles, and may ultimately determine whether or not they, and I, stay or visit Colorado.

The affected result of the construction-related disruption would be huge -- will be a huge number of people avoiding -- will result in a huge number of people avoiding the mountain corridor altogether during the construction period.

On a personal note, or my opinion, the sad part of this is that I believe that the mountain corridor will become a ghost town like many small towns in the West have become. And I also think it's sad that Mr. Norton and Governor Owens will be long gone and we will be stuck with this mess. So I encourage all of you to consider an alternative transit or to scrap the whole damn thing and wait for a new administration and get an alternative route.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	312	Dale, Jael	Public	2/9/2005	<p>I'd like to say I feel all of you are human. And, Cecelia, you and I have talked at the homeowners' association, and I've tried to attend every meeting. I ask you to please not think about your boss or your jobs but your families and where you live and your future, maybe your karma.</p> <p>Harry and I ski. He's crazy about it for the last 35 years. And when I met him five years ago -- we're married now, just six months, but he told me that it would be a huge problem since I didn't know how to ski. So he taught me to ski. And literally, one boot at a time, one ski at the time -- the most athletic thing I had ever done in my 47 years of life was throw a flag in. So it was a challenge.</p> <p>But, anyway, we get this magazine every month, Skiing, and there's an article in there -- and I'm a little nervous, sorry. The article is "True Miracle of Swiss Workmanship." It is not watches or non-lethal army knives; it's trains. Trains connecting the country's airports to its cities, its cities to its towns, its towns to its villages, and its villages to the ski slopes.</p> <p>The trains cross 6,700-foot passes, swish through four-mile-long tunnels, and they always run on time -- I'm walking because I'm nervous -- hop on board at the Zurich Airport as you can ride the rails right to Switzerland's steepest and most expansive skiing. From flashy Zermatt to the powder haven on Andermatt and Engleberg.</p> <p>The second leg of your alpine loop is on a panoramic, which is called the Glacier Express, which is the slowest part of that and the slowest fast train in the world, which passes over precisely 290 bridges and through no fewer than 91 tunnels as it chokes through the pastoral wonderland that is Southeastern Switzerland.</p> <p>This is the article. It's pretty cool. You can have it. So I thought what a cool place to visit. I know Harry would think so.</p> <p>An advanced mass transit system could do the same for us. An elevated advanced rail system could connect FasTracks -- FasTracks, because I know you can make a decision -- in Denver to the mountain ski resorts.</p> <p>So my question to CDOT is: Why isn't our vision to create a world-class mass transit system to connect the Front Range to Colorado's world-class ski resorts? Visionary.</p> <p>Shouldn't America be the leader in technology? My God, we're saving countries, our kids are dying. Let's think about that. Should we not be the leader in technology, innovation, and the implementation of a first-class -- sorry, I'm -- first-class mountain transit system -- I better stop walking -- that would attract visitors from all over the world? Really, tourism, that's where we make our money.</p> <p>We should challenge CDOT and FHWA to look beyond simply widening the highways. Yes, you're going to save jobs and your people will be able to have jobs, but will we have equity in our homes? Will we have a home? I'm from New Orleans, below sea level. I do not want to go back to New Orleans. I love living in the mountains. I love skiing. And I ask you again, as a previous speaker did, to think out of the box. Yeah, you get a paycheck. You get a great bonus, whatever it is, but don't take away our life just so you reap the benefits of it. Okay?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
---------------------	-----	------------	--------	----------	--	-------------

Categorized Comment	693	Clear Creek County Board of Commissioners	Counties	5/23/2005	<p>Clear Creek County Post Office Box 2000 Georgetown, Colorado 80444 Telephone: (303) 569-3251 (303) 679-2300</p> <p>May 23, 2005</p> <p>David Nicol, Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Ave. Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Dear Mr. Nicol,</p> <p>The following comments have been developed to address the 106/110 elements of the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Clear Creek County is a consulting party with concerns relating to historic properties throughout the proposed APE. Additional comments from the other consulting parties in the county have been forwarded to your office. We concur with their comments and concerns, and are pleased with their careful and thorough study of issues facing all of their individual domains. We would like to take this opportunity comment on issues related to historic properties throughout the county.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Little has been done to assess the historic mining properties which line the length of the I-70 corridor through Clear Creek County. There is a need to develop a context for these properties and to apply this context to the related mining sites: mines, mills and other related properties. This will require hiring someone with a specialized background. This information, once studied and presented in final form, needs to be considered at each stage of the decision making process. The portions of the county's heritage related to mining and transportation are both under-represented in the historic survey materials that now exist.</li> <li>2. The Bakerville/Graymont area is also under-represented in the historic survey. The nature of existing sites and the impact of proposed alternatives needs to be expanded.</li> <li>3. The use of the term "impact" within the DPEIS document is focused on direct construction impacts, with comments indicating that other impacts can be mitigated in Tier 2. In other words, if a building is not torn down or moved as a result of the proposed project, no impact is acknowledged. In addition, the study indicates that each of the proposed alternatives will have a similar impact on historic structures, leaving the reader with the sense that all structures would be treated the same, so there is no need for extensive individual assessment at this time. The county believes that elements generally referenced as "constructive use" (noise, vibration, visual impact) have direct impact on the county's historic resources. The impact of these factors on the recognized historic buildings and sites within the APE need to be acknowledged and addressed, with attention to changing impact based upon the various alternatives. In keeping with Section 106/110 of the Preservation Act and Section 4(f) of the Transportation Act, relative impact needs to be a major factor in the selection of a preferred alternative. The current document does not include sufficient study of the full scope of constructive use impacts, nor does it review the impact of the various alternatives on the hundreds of known historic sites. Furthermore, the currently selected "preferred alternatives" have not demonstrated the manner in which</li> </ol>	Written
---------------------	-----	---	----------	-----------	---	---------

they "avoid and minimize harm" to these valuable historic resources.

4. The county agrees with the expanded APE (roughly ridge line to ridge line), and appreciates the preliminary review of historic structures included in the amended (get name of second booklet). Hundreds of sites are included for review with the acknowledgment that all of these buildings and sites are important enough to warrant further study. It is anticipated that additional review will be undertaken in Tier 2. The need to study the properties, thereby determining their relative historical importance, should come prior to the selection of a preferred alternative in Tier 1. In other words, if the selection of a preferred alternative comes in Tier 1, then the study of historic sites should be done prior to that selection so that the relative impact can be assessed.

5. The construction of I-70 in the 1960s resulted in massive impacts to the communities, historic districts and unincorporated lands of the county. The continued widening and expansion of the roadway will have a substantial cumulative impact which needs to be addressed in more depth. Once again, the promise that this will be dealt with during Tier 2 ignores the fact that the extent and nature of the cumulative impact varies with the different alternatives. Furthermore, the explanation of relative amounts of cumulative impact, by alternative, cannot be limited to photographic presentations.

Many of the concerns mentioned in this letter as well as the letters from the other consulting parties within Clear Creek County may be addressed in a Programmatic Agreement, however, we do not believe that the existing DPEIS is sufficient for the 106/110 concerns. The executive summary mentions the need to address issues related to environmental sensitivity, historic resources and safety, as well as the need to select an alternative which can be implemented. The DPEIS however, focuses on selection of an alternative which can be implemented (below \$4 billion). We believe that this selection is detrimental to the environment, our historic resources, and safety of the traveling public.

The county would like to request completion of a full Section 106 and 110 review of the Tier 1 draft DPEIS, including cumulative impact and constructive use, prior to the selection of an alternative in the final DPEIS and adoption of a Programmatic Agreement for Tier 2.

The attached letters from other consulting parties within the county demonstrate the depth and breadth of concern within our community, and also show that the parties all remain committed to working towards a solution which can alleviate the problems without destroying the historic and environmental assets our county was built upon, and the elements of cultural tourism which support our communities today.

Thank you for taking the time to review these issues.

The Board of County Commissioners, Clear Creek County

Harry Dale, Chairman  
Joan Drury, Commissioner  
Kevin O'Malley, Commissioner

cc: U.S. Senator Wayne Allard  
U.S. Senator Ken Salazar  
U.S. Representative Mark Udall  
Colorado Senate President Joan Fitz-Gerald  
Colorado Representative Tom Plant  
Georgianna Contiguglia, Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer  
Dan Corson, Amy Pallante, Colorado State Historic Preservation Office  
Carol Legard, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation  
Ann Prinzlaff, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation  
Lysa Wegman-French, National Park Service  
James Lindberg, National Trust for Historic Preservation  
Cecilia Joy, CDOT, Project Manager  
Mary Ann Naber, FHWA, Federal Preservation Officer

Categorized Comment	698	Clear Creek County Board of Commissioners	Counties	5/24/2005	<p>Clear Creek County Post Office Box 2000 Georgetown, Colorado 80444 Telephone: (303) 569-3251 (303) 679-2300</p> <p>May 24, 2005</p> <p>Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011</p> <p>Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228</p> <p>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</p> <p>In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, Clear Creek County and the Clear Creek I-70 Task Force offer the attached comments to be included in the administrative record.</p> <p>Clear Creek County has serious concerns regarding how the proposed project will impact county resources and how those impacts will be mitigated. We are also concerned with the balance between need and project purposes (Environmental Sensitivity, Respect for Community Values, Safety, and Ability to Implement) and how the purposes will factor into the selection of the preferred alternative. It appears that cost alone is the only deciding factor and all other analyses that could either result in adverse or beneficial impacts are relegated to background material through which CDOT is able to claim they have undertaken a "hard look" in meeting the mandate of the NEPA.</p> <p>All alternatives will impact the county and for a period of fifteen years, Clear Creek County will bear the brunt of construction impacts with apparent effects on our quality of life, economy, and mobility. The lack of a detailed analysis of these impacts, especially considering the fifteen year duration, is disturbing, and leaves our citizens with very little information as to how their lives and the lives of their families will be affected.</p> <p>As far as our level of expertise will allow, we are offering comments on the following areas on the affected environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Air Quality and the lack of analysis of Mobile Source Air Toxics</li> <li>- Noise Impacts that we believe will have and overall detrimental effect on our communities</li> <li>- Environmental Justice issues that do exist in Silver Plume and quite possibly other local communities</li> <li>- Impacts to our water resources and the insufficient analysis of the impacts</li> <li>- Historic Mining in which significant potential contamination is a real possibility</li> <li>- Lack of analysis regarding land use and future desired growth of the county</li> </ul> <p>Mitigation is a key deficiency. Specificity of mitigation measures relating to each alternative is clearly lacking. Alternative mitigation measures cannot be used to compare and contrast alternatives or delineate impacts between alternatives. Deferring mitigation details to Tier 2 ignores the potential cost of mitigation and the possible effects on any one alternative's cost. The mitigation offered in the DPEIS could apply to any highway project resulting in mitigation policies that are generalized and lack commitment as to how they will be defined during Tier 2 studies.</p> <p>The Clear Creek County Commissioners have participated in the I-70 Central Mountain Coalition process and fully endorse the Regionally Preferred Alternative developed by consensus of the 31 member jurisdictions. The comments we are submitting below in no way negate our support for the Regionally Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Clear Creek County requests the Federal Highway Administration and the Colorado Department of Transportation correct key deficiencies in the DPEIS and incorporate the Coalition's Regionally Preferred Alternative within the I-70 Mountain Corridor Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.</p> <p>Approved Comments to the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement &amp; Section 4(f) Evaluation this 24th Day of May, 2005, by the Clear Creek Board of County Commissioners.</p> <p>Harry Dale, Chairman Joan Drury, Commissioner Kevin O'Malley, Commissioner</p> <p>Comments of Clear Creek County and the Clear Creek I-70 Task Force</p> <p>I. TIERING A. The DPEIS violates the mandate of 23 U.S.C. §109(h): "Not later than July 1, 1972, the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, shall submit to Congress, and not later than 90 days after such submission, promulgate guidelines</p>	Written

designed to assure that possible adverse economic, social, and environmental effects relating to any proposed project on any Federal-aid system have been fully considered in developing such project, and that the final decisions on the project are made in the best overall public interest, taking into consideration the need for fast, safe and efficient transportation, public services, and the costs of eliminating or minimizing such adverse effects and the following:

- (1) air, noise, and water pollution;
  - (2) destruction or disruption of man-made and natural resources, aesthetic values, community cohesion and the availability of public facilities and services;
  - (3) adverse employment effects, and tax and property value losses;
  - (4) injurious displacement of people, businesses and farms; and
  - (5) disruption of desirable community and regional growth.
- Such guidelines shall apply to all proposed projects with respect to which plans, specifications, and estimates are approved by the Secretary after the issuance of such guidelines".

B. We strongly suggest, that this Tier I document is the "final decision", as stated in 109(h) and proposed Tier 2 studies are merely the implementation of the final decision. Per the CEQ, "Tiering is a procedure which allows an agency to avoid duplication of paperwork through the incorporation by reference of the general discussions and relevant specific discussions from an environmental impact statement of broader scope to one of lesser scope or vice versa" (Question 24c., Forty Most Asked Question Concerning CEQ's NEPA Regulations, March 23, 1981). CDOT has, on occasion, described the DPEIS as a Tier 1.5 document. We are somehow in the middle of an action of broader scope with an action of lesser scope. This results in confusion for the reader as to the level of detail, in regards to the impacts and potential mitigation of the impacts, required to make an informed decision at this Tier I level and the appropriate review of the document in regards to commenting on its adequacy.

Per FHWA regulation 23 C.F.R. § 771.111(g): "the first tier EIS would focus on the broad issues such as general location, mode choice, and area wide air quality and land use implications of the major alternatives. The second Tier would address site specific details on project impacts, costs, and mitigation measures." The I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement incorporates elements of both a first and second tier EIS as stated in the regulation. As a result, we have found it difficult to review and develop appropriate comments, relevant to the decision to be made in regards to a Tier 1 document and the discussion contained in this Tier 1.5 DPEIS. Our conclusion is that at the level of detail discussed, the DPEIS fails to take a hard look at comparing and contrasting the alternatives, specifically in regards to construction impacts and their mitigation, and mitigation of the resource impacts necessary to delineate between the alternatives, as required by NEPA, in making a reasoned choice as to the preferred alternative.

C. FHWA Technical Advisory T 6640.8A Guidance For Preparing And Processing Environmental And Section 4(F) Documents (October 30, 1987) V.G.25 states "the EIS should discuss in general terms the proposed actions irreversible and irremediable commitment of resources." Included in V.G.25 is a general statement that some level of commitment of natural, physical, human, and fiscal resources would be required. Such a statement is relevant at the Tier I level and needs to be included in the DPEIS as required by CEQ Regulation 40 CFR 1502.16. Our concerns include, but are not limited to, the need for policy-level discussion of the depletion of fossil fuels, both as a source of energy and as a source of construction material (asphalt), the commitment of non-metallic minerals, the decision to support the further urbanization of the mountains and the creation of additional pressure on our critical wildlife habitat, and the additional impacts to water quality for the residents of the Front Range of Colorado who rely on the quality and supply of Clear Creek water. Fens, have been identified by the USFWS as irreplaceable with no possibility of acceptable mitigation (page 3.6-7). Further, "a definitive analysis of impacts on fens will be conducted at the Tier 2 level." (page 3.6-1). With this one exception, no other analysis of irreplaceable and irremediable resources is evident.

#### II. BALANCING PURPOSE AND NEED WITH IMPACTS

A. As a corridor county, Clear Creek County is separate and unique from the other corridor counties in its relationship to the I-70 corridor. Extended length of narrow valleys, number of 4(f)(1)(6) properties, and all alternatives impacting a majority county residents during construction (commuting, quality of life, property values tied to Denver markets) are factors of significant difference from our West Slope counterparts. Lump sum analysis of the corridor resource impacts is not in the spirit of NEPA in which the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, states: "— that the Nation may -- achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities;" (42 USC § 4331(b)(5)).

B. This document is unclear as to the weighting given to resource impacts (direct, indirect, and cumulative) in regards to Environmental Sensitivity, Respect For Community Values, Safety, and Ability to Implement in the selection of the preferred alternatives other than that the preferred grouping is based solely on cost and ability to accommodate baseline travel demand. Page ES-50 "Next Steps for Tier 1 PEIS...3. Review and Comment of the Final PEIS" lists nine criteria bullets in selecting the FPEIS preferred alternative. Yet, it is unclear as to how the environmentally preferred alternative (See Question 8a. of the CEQ's 40 Questions and Answers - Forty Most Asked Question Concerning CEQ's NEPA Regulations, March 23, 1981), or the agency-identified preferred alternative, (if not the same as the environmentally preferred alternative), will be selected in the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision (see Record of Decision-Format and Content, Paragraph B. FHWA Technical Advisory T 6640.8A Guidance For Preparing And Processing Environmental And Section 4(F) Documents -October 30, 1987). Stated in an FHWA Memorandum ("Tiering of the I-70 Project, Kansas City, Missouri to St. Louis," June 18, 2001), "Because you have so much flexibility in customizing the tiering approach to your specific situation, it is critical that you carefully communicate your decision-making process to affected parties." A decision matrix should be included, in the Draft PEIS describing the methodology and relative weighting given to all impacts in the evaluation leading to preferred alternative selection in the Final PEIS.

C. Reasonable cost is set at a maximum of \$4 billion in implementing a chosen mode of transportation (Section 2.4.4.1). Stated in Section 5.3 "An alternative that is not financially viable is not reasonable as defined by the CEQ and does not meet the intent of NEPA." Various references in the DPEIS (e.g. page ES-2: \$1.6 billion may be available over the next 20 years, Chart 5-1 Potential I-70 Allocation Charts) state that only \$1.6 billion is potentially available, while recognizing that additional funding sources may be available over the period of project implementation. An explanation of the derivation of the cost threshold is not evident. Without explanation in the DPEIS, the defined reasonable cost, or financially viable cost, threshold of \$4 billion is arbitrary, given only \$1.6 billion is "potentially available".

D. Section 2.4.1.1 lists the criteria for grouping alternatives. Based on a reasonableness cost threshold of \$4 billion and need to meet 2025 travel demand, Build Diesel Bus in Guideway and Preserve for Highway (Alternative I2a, Table 2-28) should be included in the Preferred Group of Alternatives. The rationale for excluding alternative 12a is not evident, given the defined thresholds of 2.4.1.1.

E. Safety analysis includes discussion of fatality accidents, injury accidents and total accidents, yet only fatality rates are used to rank the alternatives and the preferred alternatives have the highest fatality rates. Additionally, bus accident and injury data is excluded from the DPEIS (vol. 1), but "for full disclosure included in Table B-11 (DPEIS Vol. II). We have attached the comments of the Clear Creek County Emergency Medical Services Director in order to provide a detailed comment in regards to this issue.

i. "I-70 is a designated placarded hazardous route" (Section 3.8.2.5) requiring various chemical and controlled substances be diverted via Loveland Pass (U.S. Highway 6). Over the years Loveland Pass has been the scene of transportation spills, and other transportation related accidents, resulting in direct and indirect impacts. Other members of the transportation public choose to take Loveland Pass for such purposes as recreation, pleasant diversion from the corridor, or rare forced diversion in the advent E.M.T. is closed. Yet, Loveland Pass, U.S. Highway 6, is not included for analysis of the impacts amid potential mitigation of those impacts (e.g. impacts to emergency services, streams and wetlands, and subalpine and alpine ecologies). Given the direct relationship of Loveland Pass to the corridor, being a significant part of corridor transportation network, we can only surmise it should be analyzed for impacts and mitigation, for all resources in addition to safety, in the DPEIS as an integral component of I-70.

ii. CDOT identified the Georgetown Incline as being the most active rockfall area in the corridor (page 3.7-10 "ROCKFALL"). Documented numerous rockfall events, resulting in accidents and fatalities have occurred. Per the DPEIS, fencing, currently being deployed, is the preferred mitigation strategy (page 3.7-12), yet in the Spring of 2004, a section of fencing, near the scenic overlook, was obliterated with numerous large rocks covering all four lanes of the highway. In that the Georgetown Incline is acknowledged as severe rockfall hazard, as is the Silver Plume to Dumont portion of the corridor (Table 3.7-1), and is known at this Tier I level, CDOT is obligated to a more detailed examination of the potential mitigation strategies that would protect the traveling public.

iii. Section 1.7.2 discusses that a weighted hazard index (WHI) greater than 0 indicates a potentially problematic area, in terms of safety. Floyd Hill is of concern for safety (Table 1-32, milepost 246.7-247.6, steep grades, WHI=0.16) for which no mitigation measures are identified addressing the steep grade of the highway.

F. In public statements made at the January 12, 2005 Mountain Area Corridor Advisory Committee meeting, Mr. Tom Norton, Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Transportation, and Mr. David Nicol, FHWA Division Administrator, indicated there would be process of balancing the purposes and need as a transportation solution is selected. We request that this not be a discussion that takes place behind closed doors, but rather the discussion be public and visible during this Tier 1 process.

#### III. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

##### A. AIR QUALITY ISSUES

i. In Section 3.1.3.1 MOBILE SOURCE AIR TOXICS, FHWA and CDOT claim analysis and impacts of Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs) cannot be quantified. We disagree. Currently, MOBILE6 will model MSATs (See Committee on Transportation and Air Quality, U.S. EPA Highway Vehicle Emissions Models and Data for Estimating Air Toxics at <http://www.ttbairquality.com/airtoxicsworkshop.htm>). Explicitly MOBILE6 will model Benzene, I,3-butadiene, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, acrolein, and



ii. Goal 2-3 of the county master plan is intended to "provide regional and connected open space, parks, trails, and a recreational facilities systems. Part of this goal is the county's active involvement in developing the Clear Creek County Greenway to complete Clear Creek County's Intercountry Nonmotorized Master Plan. Development of the greenway is a significant piece of the county's desire to improve our quality of life by providing recreational, economic, and alternative transportation opportunities. CDOT was provided adequate notice of this plan through prior discussions and analysis of the impacts affecting the greenway, and mitigation, should be incorporated at the Tier I level.

iii. Conflicts would exist with the goals 2-1, 2-2, and 2-5 of the Clear Creek County Master Plan (referred to in Section 3.10.2.5 of the DPEIS). These goals address: (Goal 2-2) directing development to municipalities and designated mixed use areas, and to establish a hierarchy of mixed-use, pedestrian and transit urban centers; (Goal 2-5) to prepare for a balanced inter-modal and multi-modal transportation system, and (Goal 2-1) to encourage development proposals that will benefit the County's economic diversification effort. With the exception of a statement in Section 3.10.3.3 acknowledging that project alternatives "may cause conflicts with planning goals" the DPEIS fails to adequately assess, at a Tier I level, the impacts of each alternative in regards to these three goals and fails to, in general, "evaluate the seriousness of the impact of the proposal on the land use plans and policies, and whether, or how much, the proposal will impair the effectiveness of land use control mechanisms for the area" (Question 23a, of the CEQ's, Forty Most Asked Question concerning CEQ's NEPA Regulations, March 23, 1981).

iv. Lacking analysis of land use conflicts, as discussed above, the statement in Section 3.9.4 Mitigation Measures, regarding construction of the preferred alternative, that "Corridor-wide coordination, state involvement and support, and land use planning...would improve the ability of Corridor communities to maintain and protect social and economic values in the light of I-70 actions" is meaningless. Land use planning is not corridor wide but is relegated to local governing bodies as per state statutes. Without knowing the possible conflicts of each alternative with land use plans, we are unable to discriminate between the alternatives and their potential for conformance or conflict with the Master Plan.

B. Clear Creek County owns numerous lands that were conveyed by an Act of Congress (Clear Creek County, Colorado, Public Lands Transfer Act of 1993 (HR 1134, Public Law 103-253)), from the Bureau of Land Management within selected areas of the county.

i. These properties, including tracts within the I-70 right of way, have been excluded from discussion of public lands (page ES-36 2nd column "Affected Environment"), inaccurately described (page 3.10-7 "Land use ownership/jurisdiction"), and omitted from depiction (Map 3.10-1). We request that this inaccurate and incomplete information contained in the DPEIS be corrected.

ii. In regards to county property within right of way, in a letter from the Bureau of Land Management to CDOT, dated April 20, 1995, CDOT was informed that Clear Creek County is the surface management agency of those lands within highway right of way. To clear up the misstatement on land use, of those lands conveyed by the Act, 3,200 acres are managed by the Historic District Public Lands Commission under the terms of the Federal Recreation and Public Purpose Act, and 7,400 acres were conveyed to Clear Creek County for multiple purpose, of which very little is available for development, as determined by the county under the conditions of the Act. We would refer you to the detailed comments presented at public hearing on February 9, 2005 by the Clear Creek County Lands Director whose statement is attached.

C. Highway construction is an issue discussed throughout the DPEIS. We find that the discussion of construction impacts and the mitigation of the impacts to be so generic as to be applicable to any mountainous project in the state. Other than to rate the potential construction duration and traffic disruption (Table ES-4) and provide for generalized mitigation (Table 3.9-1), construction impacts and mitigation are largely deferred to a Tier II analysis. We find this to be unacceptable and would argue that at the Tier I level of analysis, construction impacts can be quantified to a greater level of detail for each of the alternatives--given the alternative working alignments used for the analysis of resource impacts--specifically in regards to, mobility, impacts to local economies, and mitigation of impacts during the construction phase.

i. Mobility, during construction, is of grave concern as it will affect provision of emergency services, delivery of goods and services, commuting needs of residents, localized economic vitality, and the quality of life along the corridor for a vast number of our county residents, for up to fifteen years. Three areas of the county are without any means of alternate transportation routes: Bakerville to the Loveland Pass interchange, Georgetown to Silver Plume, and Kerms to Hidden Valley. Other areas (such as Colorado Boulevard, County Road 314, Stanley Road, and Alvarado Road) do not have the capacity for large diversions of traffic. Possible mitigation measures, concerning traffic disruptions, are deferred to Tier II, but these are currently known conditions for which, at least, an examination could and should be conducted. Much as the corridor travel demand studies were segmented (Section 1.7.4), we would think that travel characteristics during the construction phase, (at the very least the amount of construction time required within the segments) can be generated and compared for each alternative, given the currently known construction requirements, (as alluded to in Table 2-6 and working and conceptual engineering alignments developed for Level 3 screening).

ii. Deferring mitigation to Tier II analysis understates the potentially severe impacts of construction on the natural environment and the built and social environment within Clear Creek County. This would underestimate the costs of mitigation and, in turn, the cost effectiveness index (Section 2.3.7.7). We would argue that the nature of the impacts are substantially different between the alternatives, given the currently known design characteristics and working alignments of each alternative, and may in fact be significantly different. Mitigation of the impacts, as summarized in Section 3.19, is generic to the impacts and does not compare potential mitigation strategies between the alternatives. The statutory language in 23 U.S.C. §109(h) states "...and that the final decisions on the project are made in the best overall public interest, taking into consideration the need for fast, safe and efficient transportation, public services, and the costs of eliminating or minimizing such adverse effects and the following:..." We would think that the costs of mitigation would vary by alternative, to a significant degree, that cannot be accounted for as a portion of "contingencies" applied equally to all alternatives in the Tier 1 PEIS Cost Estimates Spreadsheets.

iii. Clear Creek County is singled out for construction impacts to its economy (3.9.9.3) in which conclusions are based on perceptions and data, (we assume some kind of trend analysis from 1985 through 2001, pgs. 3.9-17 through 3.9-19). We fail to see how recreational visitation and second homes are expected to bridge a possible period of decreased visitation/travel, during an extended period of construction. We object to the conclusion that an absolute downturn in travel and visitor spending from existing levels is not indicated (p 3.9-17 2nd paragraph 1st column) because this statement is a corridor wide generalization and not specific to Clear Creek County. We believe that Clear Creek County will see an absolute downturn in travel and visitor spending during an extended construction period and believe that this statement is misleading.

iv. Instead of conjecture, REMI should model, and it is our understanding that it can, the economic impacts to Clear Creek County throughout the construction period, in order to compare and delineate the alternatives. (SEE ATTACHED LETTER, May 2, 2005 from Frederick Treyz and Jonathan Lee, Regional Economic Model, Inc.) Specifically modeling should focus on effects to local economies during the construction phase. Modeling would at least indicate the severity of the impacts and enhance mitigation of those impacts as discussed in section 3.9.4. It is not reasonable to weigh the economic effects for a nine county region extending beyond the corridor in aggregate when quantifiable and reasonably foreseeable impacts can be modeled for each county. Specifically, Clear Creek County, which is hearing the brunt of the construction impacts, but accounts for only a small portion of overall Gross Regional Product, should merit a disaggregated analysis. Although Messrs. Treyz and Lee suggest that the affected jurisdictions undertake the recommended study, we believe this task is more correctly assigned to CDOT in consultation with the local jurisdictions. It should be completed before the release of the Final PEIS so that the information generated can be used to shape the preferred alternative.

D. Executive Order 12898 and FHWA Order Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-income Populations, December 2, 1998, requires the analysis of the impact of transportation projects on minority and low-income populations. Although all of the communities in Clear Creek County will experience disproportionate impacts (relative to the rest of the corridor) there is documentation available to supplement the income data for the Town of Silver Plume. A recent survey in Silver Plume, conducted in order to secure low interest financing of a water treatment plant, indicated 57% of Silver Plume residents are low-income. This is based on the DOLA projected \$48,000 (one half of which is \$24,000) county median income for purposes of this survey. In contrast, the DPEIS Table 3.11-7 shows 27.03% of Silver Plume is low-income. Additionally in the 2000 Census, 50% of related children, in Silver Plume, under 18 years of age are determined to live in poverty status Data (Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF3)). Given Silver Plume is contained within a narrow mountainous valley with the majority of the population in close proximity to I-70 and 57% of the population is classified as low income, disproportionate impacts would occur and should be analyzed at the Tier I level as required by the hard look doctrine. For instance, transportation generated noise will significantly impact Silver Plume, in the future, affecting approximately 50% of the town at CDOT NAC of 66dB(A) (depicted on Figure 3.12-10).

#### V. MITIGATION

A. "Effective mitigation starts at the beginning of the NEPA process and not at the end. Mitigation must be included as an integral part of the alternatives development and analysis process" (FHWA, Transportation Decisionmaking, Mitigation of Environmental Impacts accessed at <http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/projects/dmmitig2.htm>). Mitigation of adverse impacts and identification of the specific mitigation measures included for each alternative is a key deficiency within the DPEIS. To the extent all mitigating actions are specified, they are typically required for any highway project during construction or at completion. Unfortunately, mitigation measures are not quantified in a meaningful manner in the DPEIS. Thus, the developed policies in the DPEIS are too generalized to discriminate between the various alternatives. A comparison of the mitigation actions and costs between alternatives is not provided and cannot be discerned from the DPEIS. In addition, assessment of alternatives and selection of the preferred alternative could be affected significantly by

the disclosure of the selected mitigation measures to be employed for each alternative and their associated costs. Failure to disclose these mitigation actions substantially devalues the alternative selection process.

B. Mitigation fails to address cumulative impacts. The DPEIS does not adequately consider the historic impacts of I-70 construction, current operational impacts, and the effectiveness of any current mitigation measures employed to mitigate past and present impacts. The original construction of I-70, undisputedly, resulted in significant impacts on the human environment, but these are only discussed in a qualitative manner and quite often combined with the impacts of current I-70 operations. The document fails to consider the impacts of the initial construction, current operations impact, and the effectiveness of employed mitigation measures as they would relate to the proposed actions. This results in an inadequate discussion of the mitigation measures for the reasonable and foreseeable future impacts. Examples would include: stream channelization, the time incremental effects of sedimentation on water resources, and loss of developable land. Changes in the highway as a result of the proposed action, (whether induced or not) will result in significant change to the human environment. CEQ states that "Only by reevaluating and modifying alternatives in light of the projected cumulative effects can adverse consequences be effectively avoided or minimized. Considering cumulative effects is also essential to developing appropriate mitigation and monitoring its effectiveness (Considering Cumulative Effects Under the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality, Page v., January, 1997).

#### VI. GENERAL COMMENTS

A. Question 17a of the CEQ's 40 Questions and Answers (Forty Most Asked Question Concerning CEQ's NEPA Regulations, March 23, 1991) refers to the execution of a disclosure statement when an environmental impact statement is prepared with the assistance of a contractor as allowed for by the CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1506.5 (c)). As part of the answer, CEQ states "When a consulting firm has been involved in developing initial data and plans for the project, but does not have any financial or other interest in the outcome of the decision, it need not be disqualified from preparing the EIS. However, a disclosure statement in the draft EIS should clearly state the scope and extent of the firm's prior involvement to expose any potential conflicts of interest that may exist." 23 U.S.C. §109(g) allows CDOT to procure under a single contract the services of a consultant to prepare an EIS as well as subsequent engineering and design work on a project. CEQ further published Guidance Regarding NEPA Regulations (48 Fed. Reg. 34263, 1983) in which the CEQ further elaborates on the need for disclosure statements by stating: "This requirement also serves to assure the public that the analysis in the environmental impact statement has been prepared free of subjective, self-serving research and analysis." J. F. Sato and Associates is involved in the Dowd Canyon Feasibility Study, Hogback Parking Facility, and Eagle-Vail Half Diamond Interchange, which all are relevant to the I-70 corridor and not disclosed (source www.fjsato.com/trans.asp). For each of these projects, we do not know the potential relationship of the project to the I-70 environmental impact statement, but if the possibility of a conflict of interest can be raised, it should be disclosed. Irregularly of the FHWA Memorandum of January 12, 1982 (re: CEQ regulation 40 C.F.R. 1506.5(c), contractor in the role of consultant need not execute a disclosure statement), we strongly believe that a disclosure statement is warranted in the DPEIS.

B. "Pollution prevention can provide both environmental and economic benefits, and CEQ encourages federal agencies to consider pollution prevention principles in their planning and decision making processes in accordance with the policy goals of NEPA Section 101 and to include such considerations in documents prepared pursuant to NEPA Section 102, as appropriate" (Memorandum to Heads of Federal Departments and Agencies Regarding Pollution Prevention and the National Environmental Policy Act, 12 January 1993 accessed at <http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/guidance.htm>). A commitment to pollution prevention should be made and incorporated into the FPEIS as a matter of policy.

C. After Level 2 screening, alignment studies and conceptual engineering studies were conducted to refine the proposed alignment for the alternatives (page 2-3), it would be useful for alignments of each alternative, on which the quantitative impacts are based (effected acres, liner feet, number of units, etc.) to be mapped, in comparison to the existing facility, in order for the reader to have a spatial reference of the alternatives and the impact discussions in the DPEIS. These maps could be included in Volume 2.

D. Clear Creek County is a consulting party for historic resources and will be submitting a separate letter regarding the review of these resources.

E. Section 3.18.2.2- seventh sentence change 24.7 mph to 24.7 mpg.

F. Last line page 3.4-16 change (EPA 1999) to (EJSEPA 1999).

G. Change the Preface Summary in Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts, to reflect section sequencing as it appears in the chapter. Noise Resources is omitted (section 4.4.5) causing a listing error beginning with Recreation Resources (shown as 4.4.5, actually 4.4.6) through Historic Properties (actually section 4.4.8). The section shown as "4.4.8 Strategies to Protect Resources" does not appear in the text body.

Cc: The Honorable Bill Owens, Governor State of Colorado  
The Honorable Mark Udall, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Joan Fitz-Gerald, Colorado State Senate  
The Honorable Tom Plant, Colorado House of Representatives  
The Honorable Wayne Allard, U.S. Senate  
The Honorable Ken Salazar, U.S. Senate

#### HEALTH EFFECTS OF MOTOR VEHICLE POLLUTANTS (Used with permission of Robert H. Yuhnke, Esq.)

Clear Creek County and the Clear Creek I-70 Task Force request that the impacts on public health of pollutants emitted from the I-70 project be included in the EIS as one of the criteria for comparing alternatives, and for the purpose of identifying mitigation measures that may be necessary to eliminate or minimize any adverse effects on public health.

#### I. Legal Duty To Assess Health Impacts of Emissions from I-70 Project.

NEPA requires that the EIS-

shall provide a full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and shall inform decisionmakers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment.

40 C.F.R. §1502.1. In disclosing significant environmental impacts and consideration of alternatives, NEPA requires that the EIS-

(d) The environmental effects of alternatives including the proposed action. The comparisons under §1502.14 will be based on this discussion. [and]

(h) Means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts (if not fully covered under § 1502.14(f)).

40 C.F.R. § 1502.16(d) and (h). The EIS must consider "the degree to which the proposed action affects public health." 40 C.F.R. §1508.27(b)(2); see also §1508.8. When a motor vehicle-related pollutant is governed by a standard, NEPA also requires that the EIS determine "whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment." 40 C.F.R. §1508.27(b)(10). To satisfy these requirements, FHWA must undertake an investigation of the adverse health effects among populations what will be exposed to air pollutants emitted in the I-70 corridor for each alternative considered, discuss alternatives in the EIS that can avoid and minimize these adverse effects on health, and where the alternatives are not sufficient to avoid adverse impacts, then include additional measures "to mitigate adverse environmental impacts."

In addition to NEPA, the Federal-Aid Highway Act requires that FHWA consider "possible adverse effects" of the "air pollution" as part of any federal decision to approve a highway project. 23 U.S.C. §109(h). Section 109(h) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act requires a three-step evaluation of air pollution impacts and mitigation measures that final decisions on the project are made in the best overall public interest." The first step is to determine the "possible adverse economic, social and environmental effects relating to any proposed project." Id. The second step is to determine "the costs of eliminating or minimizing such adverse effects and...(1) air...pollution," Id. The third step is to consider "the costs of eliminating or minimizing such adverse effects" together with "the need for fast, safe and efficient transportation" to make a final decision on the project "in the best overall public interest." Id. FHWA's implementing regulation further requires that any measures necessary to mitigate these adverse effects be incorporated into the project. 23 C.F.R. §771.105(d).

FHWA's assessment of adverse effects under section 109 is not bounded by a condition that the air pollution impacts be "significant" as defined by NEPA and its implementing regulations. Rather, section 109 calls for investigation of "possible adverse...environmental effects," including air pollution. 23 U.S.C. §109(h) (emphasis added). This analysis necessitates "the gathering and evaluation of evidence on potential pollution hazards." D.C. Fed'n of Civic Ass'ns v. Voipe, 459 F.2d 1231, 1242 (D.C. Cir. 1971). Moreover, such hazards must include the motor vehicle-related pollutants for which the EPA has implemented a NAAQS under the Clean Air Act, but are not restricted to criteria pollutants. In applying section 109 to a bridge construction project, the District of Columbia Circuit stated, "[w]e can find no basis in the statutes language or purpose for the conclusion that certain hazards are, as a matter of law, immaterial to the Secretary's evaluation of a project's safety." D.C. Fed'n, 459 F.2d at 1242.

#### II. Significance of Air Pollution Impacts on the Human Environment.

NEPA requires that impacts be discussed in an EIS if they "significantly impact the human environment." Title impacts on public health caused by air pollutants emitted from highways may well be the greatest impact from a large highway.

In a 2000 Report to Congress, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) estimated that the annual health costs of air pollution from transportation sources in the United States ranges from \$40,443,000,000.00 to \$64,600,000,000.00. This estimate is based upon health effects of public

exposure to emissions from motor vehicles of the pollutants for which NAAQS had been promulgated prior to 1997. The largest portion of the costs result from predicted increases in mortality caused by these pollutants. The Report to Congress did not include health costs for fine particles (particulate matter measuring 2.5 microns in diameter or smaller (PM<sub>2.5</sub>)) or MSAT pollutants emitted by motor vehicles. No other category of air pollution sources has a greater impact on the public health. Since the FHWA's Report to Congress, substantial new evidence has emerged showing that pollutants not included in the Report, especially fine particles and toxic air pollutants such as benzene, 1,3-butadiene, formaldehyde, and the mix of pollutants contained in diesel exhaust are associated with significant additional impacts on public health. The general health impacts of fine particles were summarized by U.S. EPA in the 1997 decision to adopt a new NAAQS for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. EPA also provided a detailed assessment of the health risks attributable to the 13 mobile source toxic air pollutants included in the Integrated National Urban Air Toxics Strategy adopted in 1999 and EPA's Final Rule adopting more stringent emissions standards for diesel engines. The findings of adverse health effects made by EPA, together with more recent evidence of adverse health effects published in reports of health effects research strongly support the conclusion that the effects on human health from pollutants emitted from highways are a significant impact on the human environment and must be disclosed in an EIS for a highway project.

### III. Identifying Air Pollutants to be Investigated.

To satisfy the obligation under §109(h) to identify "possible adverse effects," FHWA must at least consider the adverse effects of those motor vehicle-related pollutants that have been found by the U.S. EPA to endanger human health, or been shown in credible scientific investigations to be associated with adverse health effects.

a. **Criteria Pollutants.** When EPA lists a pollutant for promulgation of a NAAQS pursuant to the Clean Air Act (CAA), 42 U.S.C. §7408(a), a determination has been made that the pollutant endangers public health. Such pollutants presumptively cause "possible adverse effects" that require consideration under §109(h).

b. **MSAT Pollutants.** In addition to criteria pollutants, the hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) listed under CAA §112 also endanger public health. Of the 189 HAPs listed under the Act, the U.S. EPA has identified 21 as "mobile source air toxic" (MSAT) pollutants. Of these 21, EPA included the three statutory MSATs and ten other mobile source-related pollutants on a list of 33 priority pollutants targeted for control under EPA's Integrated National Urban Air Toxics Strategy, 64 Fed. Reg. 38,706 (July 19, 1999). This Strategy "established a list of urban HAPs [hazardous air pollutants] which pose the greatest threats to public health in urban areas, considering emissions from major, area and mobile sources." *Id.* at 38,714. EPA observed that "mobile sources are an important contributor to the urban air toxics problem." *Id.* at 38,705. The selection of HAPs for listing in the Urban Air Toxics Strategy was based upon modeling to estimate public exposures, and the application of unit risk factors reported in EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS). See 64 Fed. Reg. 38,730 (July 19, 1999) (describing the determination of risk factors in the ranking of toxic air pollutants in the development of the Urban Air Toxics Strategy). EPA's identification of concentrations of these 13 MSAT pollutants in the ambient air sufficient to present "threats to public health in urban areas" and triggers FHWA's duty to consider these pollutants as contributing to "possible adverse effects" under §109(h).

c. **DIESEL PM.** EPA added diesel exhaust emissions and 7 other pollutants to the 13 MSAT pollutants listed in the Urban Air Toxics Strategy when it published the list of MSAT pollutants required by the CAA, 42 U.S.C. §752 1(i); 66 Fed. Reg. 17,229. Diesel exhaust emissions were added to the list because EPA found that "diesel exhaust PM is of special concern because it has been implicated in an increased risk of lung cancer and respiratory disease," and "that diesel exhaust is likely to be carcinogenic to humans." 66 Fed. Reg. 5007 (January 19, 2001). EPA also noted that diesel exhaust contains "[s]ome of the toxic air pollutants associated with emissions from heavy-duty vehicles and engines include[ing] benzene, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, dioxin, acrolein, and 1,3-butadiene." 66 Fed. Reg. 5008. These findings also trigger the obligation to consider the effects of diesel emissions under §109(h).

#### d. **Published Health Effects Research.**

Peer reviewed scientific research provides compelling evidence that air pollution from highways cause "adverse effects" to public health. The EIS must include an evaluation of the health effects and exposure research to identify levels of exposure to motor vehicle-related pollutants that have been shown to be associated with adverse health effects to sensitive populations.

#### i. **Cancer Risk.**

In 2000, the South Coast Air Quality Management District in California made a major contribution to the research showing the link between cancer and mobile source pollution. The final Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study (MATES-II) measured exposures to 30 toxic air pollutants at 22 locations in the Los Angeles air basin to estimate cancer risk developed for toxic air pollutants by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board. MATES II found that cancer risk from the 30 air pollutants averages 1.4 cancers per 1,000 residents. Apportioning air pollution-related cancer risk by pollutant, MATES-II demonstrated that emissions from mobile sources account for 90% of the overall cancer risk attributable to toxic air pollutants in the five-county air district. *Id.*, p. ES-3 1, Fig. ES-2. The total cancer risk from all sources, including traffic ("on-road mobile"), non-road mobile and stationary sources, averaged across the region was found to be 1400 per million. *Id.*, p. ES-3. On-road vehicle emissions account for half of this risk, or 700 per million. *Id.*, Fig. 4-2. This equates to about 1 cancer for each 1450 exposed people.

MATES-II also demonstrated that higher levels of risk occur near highways. The study found that the range of cancer risks varied significantly across the region, from 1,120 in a million in the cleanest neighborhoods to about 1,740 in a million in the most polluted. *Id.*, p. ES-32. The Report found the greatest risk levels at locations where "the dominance of mobile sources is even greater than at other sites." *Id.*, p. ES-53. It also found that "model results, which are more complete in describing risk levels... than is possible with the monitored data, show that the higher risk levels occur... near freeways." *Id.*, B.2. "Results show that the higher pollutant concentrations generally occur near their emission sources." *Id.*, 4. These findings provide further evidence that neighborhoods near highways would experience higher concentrations than the regional averages. Based on all these observations, MATES-II concluded that "[f]or mobile source compounds such as benzene, 1,3-butadiene, and particulates associated with diesel fuels, higher concentration levels are seen along freeways and freeway junctions." *Id.*, p.5-45.3.

In an attempt to better quantify the increased cancer risk near the freeway, the Sierra Club enlisted the services of an expert transportation modeler at Resources Systems Group (RSG). RSG reported that based upon its experience in evaluating pollutant concentrations associated with highway emissions—

Modeling conducted by Resource Systems Group for several highway projects shows that exposures to both gaseous and particulate pollution emitted from highways is much greater close to the highway. The results of the modeling showed that air toxics concentration derived from motor vehicles on the highway were approximately ten times higher at 40 meters from the highway than at 300 meters from the highway.

RSG Report (January 2002), p. 51. RSG also reviewed the MATES modeling data, observing that model outputs were reported as average concentrations for each 2 kilometer square receptor grid. Therefore, the [modeled] estimates are not worst case nor do they represent the exposure levels for residences close to major highways. Exposure levels close to major highways will be higher, and depending on distance, wind direction, and other factors, may be considerably higher." *Id.* Thus the cancer risks to populations in close proximity to a major freeway will be substantially greater, possibly 10 times greater, than the regional cancer risks attributable to motor vehicle emissions.

#### ii. **Risks to Sensitive Populations.**

Particularly important for assessing the adverse health impacts of emissions from highways located near school buildings and residential areas are recent research reports that have focused on the links between motor vehicle emissions and adverse health effects suffered by children.

A new study designed to determine whether the proximity of 10 middle schools to major freeways in California's East Bay caused adverse health effects among school children aged 10 to 12 found a statistically significant greater prevalence of diagnosed asthma and bronchitis among students at the four schools most affected by motor vehicle emissions. At each school, the study monitored concentrations of a number of motor vehicle-related pollutants, showing that PM<sub>2.5</sub> was 25% higher in a school yard 60 meters from a freeway than at monitors located a mile from the freeways. Black carbon, a component of diesel exhaust measured at the schools, was also shown to increase with proximity of the school to a major highway. Carbon levels were 55% higher at the school closest to a freeway compared to schools that were more than a mile distant from a freeway. Air quality at every school complied with national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS).

A study in the Bronx, New York, investigated truck traffic, particulate matter and carbon concentrations in the neighborhood around the Hunts Point terminal where one in three children have asthma (compared to one-in-five nationally), and the hospitalization rate for asthma is 12 times the national average. The reported carbon levels used as a surrogate for diesel emissions ranged at six sites from more than two to nearly seven times greater than the levels reported at the school site in the East Bay Children's Respiratory Health Study with the highest levels. Carbon concentrations were found to correlate strongly with daily diesel truck traffic on the streets nearest the monitor.

The data from both the East Bay and the Hunts Point studies strongly suggest that carbon levels associated with diesel emissions may be directly responsible for inducing the allergic response that is asthma, or they are a sound surrogate measure of the mix of chemicals in diesel exhaust that initiate asthma. According to the President's Task Force on Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children, America is in the midst of an asthma epidemic. EPA has observed, once asthma is induced in a child, "asthma cannot be cured, only controlled. Since the East Bay study suggests that the numbers of children diagnosed with asthma appear to increase during the few years children are in middle schools located near highways, the greater number of years that young children will be exposed during the elementary years at Carleton Elementary School threatens to impair the health of these children for the remainder of their lifetimes.

Another study assessed the impact of pollution levels on lung development from the ages of 10 to 18. Measurements of lung function in large cohorts of school children who were followed for eight years in 12 California communities demonstrate large deficits in three measures of lung function among students living in the communities with the highest pollutant concentrations compared with comparably aged students in communities with the lowest pollutant concentrations. By age 18, when most lung growth has been completed, these reductions in lung function were expected to remain throughout the lifetime and contribute to future health complications. The motor vehicle-related pollutants elemental carbon and NO<sub>2</sub> were two of the three pollutants most strongly correlated with this adverse health outcome. In the most polluted community in the study, the eight-year elemental carbon concentration was comparable to the carbon level reported in the school yard closest to a freeway in the East Bay Children's Respiratory Health study, and more than five times lower than the highest carbon levels



measured in the Hunts Point neighborhoods adjacent to truck routes. These studies demonstrate that children in neighborhoods exposed to the pollutants emitted from freeways and major truck routes are at significantly greater risk of life-long health impairment from reduced lung function as well as asthma. New research aimed at attempting to find an explanation for children who die of cancers before age 16 also found a strong correlation between the proximity of the residence of the mother to highways (less than one kilometer) during fetal development and the first months following birth. Another study identified increased chromosome aberrations in newborns who were exposed to PAHs found in diesel exhaust during pregnancy as a result of the mother living in neighborhoods in Upper Manhattan and the South Bronx. These chromosome aberrations are often a precursor to the development of cancer. This provides a plausible mechanism to explain why children die of cancer before age 16. Exposure to diesel exhaust in the womb may be one of the most harmful effects of vehicle-related emissions. Together, these studies suggest that fetuses may be the population most vulnerable to the adverse health effects of motor vehicle-related pollutants.

These and other recent field research demonstrate that the emissions control programs adopted under the CAA for gasoline and diesel vehicles do not protect against adverse health effects attributable to motor vehicle emissions from large numbers of vehicles such as occur on heavily trafficked highways, interchanges, truck and bus terminals, airports, or seaports. The American Pediatric Association, the national association of physicians specializing in children's health, highlighted the threats to children in a new Policy Statement issued in 2004. The APA Policy Statement made recommendations to protect children from the harmful effects of air pollution, including a policy that schools not be located near highways. This recommendation should be given strong weight in comparing alternatives in the I-70 corridor. If alternatives continue to be considered that include increased traffic loads in close proximity to the Swansea Elementary School, then the EIS must include consideration of mitigation measures that include the health benefits of relocating the elementary school away from the traffic.

#### IV. Consideration of Alternatives.

The fact that pollutants emitted from highways cause severe adverse health effects calls for consideration of all available alternatives designed to reduce emissions and exposure to these harmful pollutants. One option open for consideration is the relation of the highway to an alignment removed from schools and residential areas. This is an attractive alternative from the perspective of reducing exposures to children if it reduces exposures at the school site and in the Idaho Springs neighborhood. But exposures need to be compared throughout the different alignments in all alternatives. The difference in emissions and resulting exposures for transit vehicle technologies also need to be taken into account.

Unless pollutant concentrations are reduced to levels that can be safely found to have no significant impact on human health, other mitigation measures that reduce emissions and human exposures also need to be considered. These include the creation of buffer zones along the right-of-way to ensure that new health hazard areas are not created within proximity to a new alignment, measures that reduce single occupancy vehicle traffic in the corridor including land use and transit oriented development, and diesel retrofit/replacement programs that reduce emissions from the source.

Attached to end of the document are four impact zone maps and statements from the Clear Creek County Land Director (presented at the public hearing Feb. 9, 2005, and a letter to Peggy Stokstad from REM

Categorized Comment	454	Davidson, Meg	Public	4/11/2005	Dear Ms Joy,  I am writing in regard to the I-70 PEIS. I am strongly opposed to the widening of I-70. Such a project would severely damage water quality, scenery, tourism-related business, wildlife habitat and migration, and the quality of life for local residents. A transit alternative, such as a fixed guideway system would minimize new impacts to wildlife and water quality compared to other alternatives. Thanks for your time and consideration.  Meg Davidson and Josh Pineda	Written
Categorized Comment	720	Davies, Eileen	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  Long-term transportation strategy to include some form of mass transit. Eileen Davies egdavies@earthlink.net 525 Night Chant Lane Frisco	Written
Categorized Comment	648	Davis, Charles	Public	5/24/2005	To: Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Ave. Aurora, CO 80011  Re: I-70 Expansion  Dear Cecelia,  This letter is in response to the alternatives proposed by the Colorado Department of Transportation's widening of I-70.  I have lived in this area most of my life and have seen the tremendous negative environmental impact I-70 has brought to the Clear Creek area. There is much more than the mere traffic congestion that affects this corridor and needs to be weighed at least equally with further construction.  The noise pollution, which at times limits normal conversation has increased every year and has been measured at over 76 decibels by our homeowners association. To date nothing has been done to alleviate this situation and, as a matter of fact, the area west of Silver Plume was never included in the PEIS report. I would suggest that this be included and noise mitigation be started even if no I-70 expansions are performed. Since the regular use of Magnesium Chloride was started, almost every tree between my home and I-70 has died! This may not be the Mag Chloride directly killing the vegetation, but a result of the Mag Chloride affecting the solubility of the soil which indirectly starves the vegetation of water. The expansion of I-70 will only worsen the existing problem, leading to a corridor of dead trees.  At our recent homeowner's meeting, we agreed that the Colorado Department of Transportation work on specific "pinch points," as noted in their PEIS "minimal action preferred alternative." This would include the Eisenhower Tunnel, Georgetown Hill, US 40, and I-70 interchange, as well as the twin tunnels east of Idaho Springs, before other expansions. I would agree that in the long term, a mass transit (train, monorail, etc.) should be looked at for the above reasons and the very real dependency all mountain communities have on oil. Should gasoline reach \$5.00 to \$7.00 a gallon, as in Europe, I would suggest that people will find the mountains too expensive to visit by car! This type of expansion can be routed around sensitive areas (North side of I-70 near our neighborhood).  Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns. I look forward to hearing back from you!  Sincerely, Charles Davis	Written
Categorized Comment	537	Davis, Charles	Public	5/22/2005	Lady or Gentleman: We are owners of Lot 1 and Lot 6 of Silver valley park estates. This property is located east, 1.4 statute mile from the village of Bakerville, colo. Our ownership dates to Sept. 1960. We were owners through the building of I-70 District #1 and Supt. Downing. The building of the Tunnel etc. The construction of a new & improved I-70 will not help my personal enviroment. All the trees that still were alive during the I-70 construction were alive until the start of the use of Magnesium Chloride. Regaurdless of all the documents shown on this web site. The noise of the tractor trailer vehicles has reach a DB level ?? that it sleep is prohibutive. We have called your Dept. trying to get DEAD TREES removed from YOUR ROW. Many letters, Phone Calls have be sent and made. Some Phone calls telling me that Public Service(now doing business as XCEL ENERGY) must clear their area under the power line that sit on your ROW. I have called and have stoped at your CDOT shop @ I-70 & U.S. # 40 shops. We have discussed Dead Trees on YOUR ROW, that cause a real fire hazzard to my property, that now is located less that 50 feet from your gard-rail. I end up getting a burn permit to burn slash from the ROW of COLORADO. So now I must say NO-NO to any inprovmnt???? to the I-70 Corridor.We would need a sound wall installed to lower the DB level. Strict control of trucks using JAKE-Brakes without the use of muffles to lower the DB level after the noise walls would be installed. I see YOUR major problems in traffic movments are,  #1 Floyd Hill and the bridge crossing Clear Creek moving west. #2 The twin tunnels near Idaho Sprgs. #3 Idaho Spgs. all the negative comment of TAX payers. #4 The Georgetown-Silver Plume Hill. I rember the two "S" or hair pin curves #5 The Johnson-Eisenhaur continental divide tunnels	Online

#6 Trying to solve all the noise problems at Dillon, Frisco, Silverthorne, and god forbid "VAL"  
 #7 When Gasoline sells for \$ 6.00 a Gallon and is 15% of GDP of the family are we going to see an increase of units per mile??

Thank you for letting me voice my opinion, even if this long memo may never be read.

Charles A. and Msry Ann Davis

Categorized Comment	743	Davis, Kelly	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Please research tractor trailer percentage use on I-70 Maybe truck guideway?</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	779	Dayton, Annadane	Public	5/18/2005	<p>New highways or expansions never keep up with demand. We need an alternative which will decrease the number of cars on I-70. Annadane Dayton PO Box 7503 Breckenridge CO 80424 ahd.1@juno.com</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	148	Debenham, Etta	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Thank you. I'm a Clear Creek County resident.</p> <p>I also think that you should extend the comment period. And I guess my concern is that you already have your minds made up. And I hope that you will really listen to the public because our concerns are legitimate.</p> <p>And if you look at Glenwood Canyon, you'll see that there's a really good working viable alternative, and we can have the same viable alternative here. And it isn't going to be widening, because bottom line, it doesn't solve the problem. When it's done -- when construction is done, you're going to have the same problem. In 15 years of stop-and-go construction, it is going to destroy tourism in this state. People aren't going to want to sit -- you'll have less people willing to make that -- to go to the ski areas.</p> <p>I strongly favor the AGS. I don't think that your cost estimates are valid at all. You don't consider that the private sector could participate in this in creating stations and freights and many different ways.</p> <p>And I guess the question, and I'd like you to answer it, is: if it could be shown that the private sector could participate, if you would put that into a preferred alternative?</p> <p>The AGS does not have to follow the I-70 footprint, which is a plus, because it means you don't have to destroy -- don't have to extend the widening, you know, to our environmentally sensitive areas, which Ed Rapp so really thoroughly and eloquently raised. And it takes cars off the road instead of adding cars to the road. It limits accidents and fatalities. You could move freight. It's less disruptive.</p> <p>And then I had a concern as a Clear Creek County resident. As others have said, we only have one way in. You know, if locals -- if, as we've been told, you plan to shut down the highway at various times, how do we -- where do we go? How do we move? How do emergency vehicles move? I find that really troubling. I think that maybe you should consider a second or other additional accesses to the Western Slope as Jo Anne Sorensen mentioned the growth in Park County. Perhaps there could be a better access through that way.</p> <p>Okay. And then, finally, Clear Creek County is in the process of developing a fabulous greenway project to help us economically, and I think that widening would absolutely undermine any possibility for the success of that.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	474	Decker, Sean	Public	5/6/2005	<p>I thought that your Draft PEIS was very well put together and contained a large amount of information on the various alternatives, with that in mind, I have a few questions. First, why did you include all the various alternatives, even if it was acknowledged that there was no way they could be built? For example you included the 6-Lane Highway with AGS alternative, even though you stated that four billion dollars was the cut-off for an alternative to be economically feasible, and this was more than double that cost. If the answer to this is that you must include all alternatives, no matter how unlikely they are, then how do you draw the line at what is too far-fetched?</p> <p>The other thing that I would like to know is, what is the purpose of this project? I know the stated purpose is the alleviation of congestion, but what happens once we get past the year 2025? Will this highway just be made even larger then? I think that we can not keep simply adding on to our road systems. Eventually, we will have to set a limit, and I am worried that the simple alleviation of congestion is a short-sighted solution. We should try to modify driving behaviour, for example more car-pooling, or more mass transit systems. I would like to know what your plans are for the long-term (past 2025), and if completely different alternatives, such as the reduction of traffic, rather than an increase in capacity were ever considered.</p> <p>One other problem that I had with the Draft PEIS was the lack of information about environmental issues. I know it is a Tier 1 document, but when things like "Chart ES - 33. Impacts on Wetlands" are shown, no information is given on what the impacts will be: what species will be affected, how strong the disruptions will be, etc. I feel that more should have been done so that people could have at least some idea about what will happen in the affected areas. It doesn't even state if the area affected is one continuous piece, or many small parcels.</p> <p>I know that it sounds like I am just complaining, but I feel these issues are important, especially the actual NEED for even more roads. I do think that overall, a very good job was done on this Draft PEIS, and I agree with your recommendations for preferred alternatives based on prices. While mass transit would be nice, if it is not affordable, road construction should be completed.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,        Sean Decker</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	634	Winter Park Resort	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	<p>May 24, 2005</p> <p>Cecilia Joy        Project Manager        Colorado Department of Transportation        Region 1        18500 East Colfax Avenue        Aurora, CO 80011        Cecilia.joy@dot.state.co.us</p> <p>Jean Wallace, P.E.        Senior Operations Engineer        Federal Highway Administration        12300 West Dakota Avenue        Lakewood, CO 80228        Jean.Wallace@fhwa.dot.gov</p> <p>Dear Cecilia and Jean:</p> <p>As the Vice-President and General Manager of Winter Park Resort, I thank you for this opportunity to add my comments to the many you have received regarding the I-70 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS).</p> <p>As you are aware Winter Park Resort is owned by the City and County of Denver and operated by Intrawest Colorado. Intrawest Colorado also operates Copper Mountain and has other interests in the Colorado High Country. We are also represented by Colorado Ski Country USA (CSCUSA), a the trade association representing 24 Colorado ski resorts, several of which along with Winter Park and Copper Mountain rely on the I-70 Mountain Corridor for resort access for both day and destination skiers. As a member of CSCUSA we have been actively involved in discussions with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for more than seven years on the need for improvements to the I-70 Mountain Corridor. Through CSCUSA we have participated in the Steering Committee for the Major Investment Study (MS) that was conducted on the corridor and has been involved in the Mountain Corridor Advisory Committee (MCAC) and the Finance Committee for the effort currently underway on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). We appreciate the extensive public and stakeholder outreach that has been the hallmark of the PEIS preparation team.</p> <p>CSCUSA has represented us well over the course of the PEIS Winter Park Resort endorses the course of action identified by the association.</p> <p>While the process of engaging with stakeholders along the I-70 Mountain Corridor has been a lengthy and arduous one, Winter Park Resort commends CDOT and FHWA for their fortitude and, more importantly, for the extensive and thorough analysis that is included in the PEIS. Winter Park Resort appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft PEIS.</p>	Email

The following statements compiled by CSCUSA have been adopted by Winter Park Resort and are worth reiterating.

#### Ski Industry Trends

The Draft PEIS projects that skier visits at resorts along the I-70 Mountain Corridor will increase by 13 percent between 2000 and 2025. The PEIS also states that data from CSCUSA is among the data used to make this projection. While CSCUSA realizes that part of CDOT and FHWA's task is to model future traffic demand, CSCUSA's data on past skier visits is not an accurate predictor of future skier visits on the micro scale set forth in the demand model.

CSCUSA does not have a crystal ball, but we do know that the recent decline in destination skier visits has been nearly reversed, with international visitors being a particularly strong component of the reversal. Additionally, Front Range skiers make up approximately 40 percent of annual skier visits in Colorado. With continued population growth projected for the Front Range, CSCUSA expects that the Front Range will continue to attract younger participants into the sport of skiing. Front Range guests are a sophisticated market—price sensitive, snow sensitive and traffic sensitive. The wide availability of low-priced season pass products is expected to continue and, in years with good snowfall, Front Range skiers will ski more than they will in drier years. Nearly all of these skiers are I-70 users.

The Front Range skier, armed with an affordable season pass, has changed his/her travel behavior as much as the I-70 mountain corridor will allow over the last several years. The season pass holder, having invested in the cost of a season pass, is now more inclined to leave the Front Range very early in the morning on a weekend day and return earlier in the day or return after the resorts have closed to avoid peak traffic. In addition, while the day skier market continues to be strong, we have seen a substantial increase in the Colorado overnight category with Front Range skiers taking more overnight trips in each of the last several years, at least in part because of I-70 congestion. These behaviors have caused a spreading out of the peak demand times on the corridor on winter weekends. The season pass holder will ski more some years and less in others, depending on snow quality and abundance, perception of hassles on I-70, the weather in Denver and other variables. However, a day skier from the Front Range who buys a lift ticket for a single day is more likely to ski a longer day, returning home after resorts have closed for the day.

To the extent that the PEIS discusses the need to change travel behavior and suggests the possibility of "alternate recreation schedules" as ways to address congestion issues on the corridor, CSCUSA urges CDOT and FHWA to recognize that, with regard to winter schedules in particular, there is not additional opportunity for changes in travel behavior or alternate recreation schedules for skiers. Ski resorts are up and running during winter daylight hours, normally 9 am to 3 or 4 pm, depending on the time of season. Efforts to change behavior will not be able to alter the length of a ski day or the interest of the skier in skiing enough of a ski day to feel as though he or she got his or her money's worth that day. Ski resorts have offered incentives to skiers to purchase passes for use during off-peak times that exclude weekends. These products are well received by the limited number of individuals who are not tied to work and school obligations Monday through Friday. CSCUSA does not foresee fundamental changes in work and school schedules that would allow alternate recreation schedules in the winter months.

Access to skiing and to other mountain recreation opportunities is a quality of life issue for Coloradans, an economic development issue for Colorado, especially the Front Range, and an economic impact issue for the entire state. Colorado ski resorts compete for skiers in a global marketplace and I-70 currently represents at a minimum a challenge and for many an obstacle to choosing to vacation in Colorado. Annual skier spending in Colorado totals approximately \$2.5 billion. A majority of that total is generated along the I-70 mountain corridor. We can say with certainty that this number would be higher without the current competitive disadvantage presented by I-70 relative to other destinations.

#### What's the alternative?

The PEIS details the need for improvements to the I-70 corridor—increased capacity, improved accessibility and mobility, and decreased congestion. The "no action" and "minimal action" alternatives considered in the PEIS do not serve the need on the corridor and should be discarded from further consideration.

The I-70 mountain corridor desperately needs capacity improvements in the near-term and a long-term vision to address future anticipated growth. CSCUSA supports continued efforts by CDOT and FHWA to address the underlying need while providing for and accommodating sensitivity to the environment, respect for community values, improvements to corridor safety and an implementable approach. The current congestion on the corridor frustrates travelers and poses continuing air quality challenges, as vehicles stuck in traffic idle on I-70 for hours during peak periods.

CSCUSA supports the addition of an additional highway lane both eastbound and westbound between Floyd Hill and the Eisenhower Tunnel, including a third bore to add capacity to the Eisenhower and Twin Tunnels. In addition, CSCUSA supports preserving the corridor for future transit. Consistent with the I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition, CSCUSA believes that currently there is neither the technology nor knowledge about transit in a mountain corridor to implement such a transit system. We also agree that it is time to begin research and planning for corridor transit in the future.

This alternative will provide for much needed capacity improvements within the 20-year time horizon that have a reasonable chance of being fundable with anticipated monies. It recognizes the longer-term growth anticipated along the corridor and allows for deliberate planning for such growth, both in terms of mobility and fiscal responsibility.

#### Sequencing

The I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition has commented at length about its preferred sequencing of capacity improvements to the corridor, with a particular preference to perform improvements in the Idaho Springs area last. While CSCUSA is respectful of the Coalition and its preferred approach, CSCUSA would urge that CDOT and FHWA bring their considerable expertise to bear on the issue of sequencing and determine the sequencing of improvements between Floyd Hill and the Eisenhower Tunnels that will optimize mobility and mitigate congestion. The addition of capacity to the entire stretch between Floyd Hill and the Eisenhower Tunnels, while leaving Idaho Springs unimproved until the end of the process will simply result in a bottleneck at Idaho Springs.

#### Construction Impacts

CSCUSA agrees with the I-70 Corridor Coalition that further analysis of corridor mobility during the construction period of the selected alternative should be considered and set forth in the Final PEIS. The draft assumes that alternatives will be completed by 2025 with evaluations on how well they meet estimated 2025 travel demand. Construction mobility restrictions and related impacts should be identified and evaluated, so that corridor stakeholders and visitors can plan accordingly. Special controls during construction should be considered, including off-peak controls or incentives for trucks and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes.

Additionally, CSCUSA believes that a 15-year projected construction period is too long. Every effort should be brought to bear to compress the timeframe during which this vital economic lifeline is under construction. CDOT has successfully compressed the Southeast Corridor or "T-REX" project into a 6-8-year timeframe. It should do the same for the I-70 Mountain Corridor.

Construction in this corridor also will require a massive level of communication with the traveling public. Corridor stakeholders need additional information about construction impacts and assurances that they will not bear the sole burden of communicating these impacts with the traveling public.

#### Funding

CSCUSA's involvement in more than seven years of effort to address improvements to the I-70 mountain corridor has always been tempered by fiscal reality. Colorado's statewide transportation needs are currently not being met by available funding. Colorado voters will have an opportunity to vote on Referenda C and D in November 2005. Even if both pass, however, the funding is unlikely to provide \$4 billion for the I-70 Mountain corridor. The projected \$4 billion represents optimistic, but not necessarily realistic funding sources that will be available for corridor improvements. We strongly urge C-DOT to contact every member of the congressional delegation and ask for a cohesive effort on behalf of all Colorado to join forces to resolve these funding issues beyond the traditional allocations.

CSCUSA believes that the preferred alternative selected by CDOT and FHWA in the final PEIS will be the result of difficult choices with regard to funding. CSCUSA urges CDOT and FHWA to fund the nearer term capacity improvements first and then to preserve the corridor and study transit. It does not benefit or behoove any corridor stakeholder to insist on a preferred alternative without reliable funding to implement that alternative.

#### Transit

CSCUSA agrees with the I-70 Corridor Coalition that the transit will be needed to provide an addition to the highway system to address the longer-term transportation needs of the corridor. Transit must be at least as fast as the highway mode, provide seamless connections to DIA and be networked into systems that serve the Front Range and corridor communities and destinations. The transit mode need not be aligned with the highway; actual alignment should be determined in the future based on need, technology, financing and connectivity.

The transit mode must be one that Front Range and corridor residents will use regularly, so it must be inexpensive for the rider and provide virtually door-to-door service, with minimal hassles and mode changes. The simple reality is that the Front Range visitor will not use a system that is costly or complex. If the Front Range visitor doesn't use the system regularly, congestion in the corridor will not be reduced. A transit system that is attractive only to destination visitors does not solve the quality of life

problem for Coloradans and doesn't serve the need of the I-70 Corridor PEIS.

The draft PEIS sets forth only the unlikely scenario whereby a Front Range family would drive from their home to a large park-and-ride near C-470. They would load their family and ski, camping, biking (or other) gear onto the transit system, ride to the Frisco Transit Center, where they would board a bus to take them to their destination. CSCUSA urges CDOT and FHWA to address these issues in a substantive way before committing significant resources to transit planning for the corridor.

The draft PEIS acknowledges that there are substantial unresolved issues with regard to transit in the corridor, such as identifying a transit operator, identifying a funding stream to cover "expected" subsidization, and devising a supporting local system to transport day recreation or overnight visit travelers to their destination. CSCUSA urges CDOT and FHWA to address these issues in a substantive way before committing significant resources to transit planning for the corridor.

A substantially more in-depth ridership study is needed for any promising transit mode. The ridership study conducted for the PEIS was flawed in a variety of ways—it was intended to be only a "snapshot" profile of users on one summer weekend and one winter weekend in 2000. Users' license plates were photographed and a small portion of users captured were subsequently interviewed by telephone, up to two months after the date on which their license plate number was captured. According to the ridership study, many of the respondents had no memory of their travel on the required weekend, so they were asked to speak generally about their most recent trip.

This "snapshot" showed a high percentage of travelers interested in using a high-speed monorail if it were faster than driving and if the round-trip cost was \$20 per person. Similar responses were recorded for bus or van service that was faster than driving and cost \$20 round-trip. The study did not address door-to-door connection issues or transport of recreational equipment. Interest in transit options among this snapshot group fell off precipitously as the cost per roundtrip increased. CSCUSA is concerned that assumptions have been made in the PEIS about likely ridership of a transit system without adequate study of the full experience of using a transit system and without projecting the round-trip cost to users of the system. Given the economic constraints facing transportation in Colorado, assuming any sort of subsidy for operation of a transit system—or simply not addressing this issue seems unwise. CSCUSA would urge that CDOT and FHWA make plans to do extensive, investment-grade user research before proceeding with future transit plans. Such research should provide valuable information about the costs and details of a suitable future transit system for the corridor.

Again, Winter Park Resort appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the draft PEIS for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you would like further input or information.

Gary DeFrane, Vice-President, General Manager, Winter Park Resort

Comment ID	Author	Category	Date	Content	Status
457	Delaloye, Sarah	Public	4/13/2005	<p>4/13/05</p> <p>Written</p> <p>Dear Cecelia,</p> <p>Please consider the Advanced Guideway System-elevated monorail-as an alternative to widening the I-70 corridor. Gasoline is now a premium and we need to conserve rather than encourage use of the automobile. More lanes means more cars, not necessarily less congestion.</p> <p>We need to make our I-70 corridor useful for local inhabitants as well as for visitors. I think that an efficient rail system that caters to visitors would be a great asset. Local areas would need to meet the monorail with transportation to get visitors to their hotels.</p> <p>Now is the time to consider types of transportation that conserve on fossil fuels. We just cannot continue to use gas at the rate we are. That is unless we just want to use up any oil reserves more quickly. Please consider this option. I believe that this option was voted down in the past by citizens. I would like to see it put up as a vote to the people now that we are facing decline oil reserves.</p> <p>Widening the lanes into existing communities along I-70 will also diminish the quality of life there-noise, closing of businesses.</p> <p>We also need to concentrate on taking care of the freeways that we already have.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sarah Delaloye 2042 W. Caley Ave. Littleton, Colorado 80120</p>	Written
818	Town of Silverthorne	Municipalities	5/24/2005	<p>Silverthorne, Colorado 601 Center Circle P.O. Box 1309 Silverthorne, Colorado 80498</p> <p>VIA FAX 303.343.0596</p> <p>Ms. Cecelia Joy, Project Manager CDOT Region 1 Colorado Department of Transportation 18500 East Colfax Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>May 24, 2005</p> <p>Re: I-70 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS)</p> <p>Dear</p> <p>These comments are submitted in accordance with the Colorado Department of Transportation's notice of the I-70 PEIS.</p> <p>As Mayor of the Town of Silverthorne—a member of the I-70 Coalition—I have actively participated as in the Coalition's work and generally support the Coalition's comments on the PEIS. The Coalition's comments have largely concerned the elimination of perceived pinch points along the I-70 corridor, as well as allowing space for the eventual inclusion of a mass rapid transit solution for the corridor.</p> <p>While wholeheartedly supportive of such measures, I must express a concern which is not specifically addressed in the Coalition's comments. These do address several intersections as well as other pinch points such as tunnels, they really do not take a comprehensive look at the core issues of capacity throughout Clear Creek County, particularly the section through Idaho Springs. It would appear as if eliminating several pinch points, but not all, there is the clear danger of creating one massive pinch point centered on the Town of Idaho Springs. I trust that the CDOT professionals are keenly aware of this issue and expect that it will be addressed, up front and comprehensively without invoking the vague hope that a transit solution will be at hand to solve a problem that is not in the future, but has been besetting us for some time.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lou DePiccolo</p> <p>General Government (970) 262-7300 fax (970) 262-7312 Public Safety (970) 262-7320 Community Development (970) 262-7360 Public Works (970) 262-7340 Recreation &amp; Culture (970) 262-7370</p>	Written
505	Desfosses, Kristi	Public	5/16/2005	<p>I have reviewed the draft PEIS and attended a meeting to discuss it. I am very disappointed with this whole process. It is very obvious that CDOT is in favor of a quick-fix rather than a forward thinking approach to what our state should look like in the future. The short-shirt that was given to mass transit options is apparent. The corridor should be a trip through what is truly special about our state – including historic mining towns and a beautiful environment. It should not be a concrete superhighway just to move people from Point A in Denver to Point B in Vail at the complete ruination of everything in between. Please listen to what the people of Colorado are telling you rather than just going ahead with what you hoped to do from the beginning.</p>	Online
744	Deshaies, Ken	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Any lane widening will create incredible traffic nightmares for years, driving resort visitors to other resorts, like Park City (where they will fly to Salt Lake and shuttle to the ski area - and still get more ski time in than driving to Summit County). Ken Deshaies 472 Big Horn Circle Silverthorne, CO 80498 Ken@SnowHome.com</p>	Written

Categorized Comment	610	Dietz, Leonard	Public	5/24/2005	I would like to see improvements on I70 but not at the cost of destroying all the towns along th corridor. I would like to see a more efficient use of the existing available right-a-way. I don't think it makes sense to keep putting drivers on one lone road into the mtns. I know that I70 is an interstate hwy, but why cant we come up with another road into the mtns., such as using hwy 285 as another option. Put a tunnel under Hoosiers Pass and bring traffic into the area another way? I would like to see electric transportation used in the median if other modes are used., so we don't have diesel pollution. I like the idea of using reversible lanes also.I wouldn't want to see the same mistake made in the mtns like I70 going through the Swansea area of Denver, and now they want to move the hwy to help the people with the noise and pollution. Let's not destroy the small towns in the mtns for a hwy. The people with the most to loose should have the most say in the decision making process. I'd like to see a solution that's a win/win for all. Thank you L Dietz	Online
Categorized Comment	644	Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/19/2005	<p>May 19, 2005</p> <p>Ms. Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Ms. Chris Paulsen, Deputy Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Re: I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy and Ms. Paulsen:</p> <p>On behalf of the Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project (SREP), please accept these formal comments on the I-70 Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Draft PEIS). We appreciate the opportunity to comment, and hope that the following recommendations will assist CDOT in incorporating the most effective wildlife mitigation measures into the Final PEIS and Record of Decision (ROD).</p> <p>Founded in 1992, The Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project (SREP) is a non-profit conservation biology organization working to protect and restore large, continuous networks of land in the Southern Rockies ecoregion of Colorado, Wyoming and New Mexico. SREP utilizes conservation science principles and geographic information system (GIS) mapping technology to identify and protect wildlands critical to the preservation of native biodiversity in the Southern Rockies.</p> <p>SREP is becoming a non-profit leader in the emerging field of "Road Ecology." In April of 2005, SREP hosted the first-ever Rockies Wildlife Crossing Field Course in Payson, Arizona with the Arizona Department of Transportation, Arizona Game and Fish Department, and many other sponsors (see <a href="http://www.restoretherockies.org/field_course.html">http://www.restoretherockies.org/field_course.html</a> for more information on the course). The purpose of this 3-day course was to provide examples of regional connectivity analyses and to share the successes and challenges of incorporating effective wildlife mitigation measures into transportation planning and highway construction in an efficient and economic manner. The second day of the course was conducted in the field. The course was a great success with approximately 140 planners, engineers, and biologists from resource and transportation agencies, municipalities, counties, non-profits, and foundations representing sixteen states and three Canadian provinces. Attendees of this workshop learned the best management practices and newest available science used to incorporate wildlife crossing structures into the planning, design, construction, maintenance and performance monitoring of ecologically sound and economically efficient transportation projects. They also had the opportunity to view a suite of wildlife crossings in various stages of development in Payson, Arizona on US highway 260.</p> <p>Proceedings from the course will be available this June on the SREP and the Center for Transportation and the Environment (CTE) website (<a href="http://ltre.ncsu.edu/cte/">http://ltre.ncsu.edu/cte/</a>). These proceedings will be a great resource for biologists, engineers and transportation agencies and are cited in the following comments.</p> <p>I. GENERAL COMMENTS</p> <p>3.2.1 Biological Resources: Introduction (p. 3.2-1)</p> <p>A. The Final PEIS should include additional background information and research citations on the effects that roads have on habitat fragmentation and wildlife movement to support its claims.</p> <p>We sincerely support CDOT's recognition that:</p> <p>"Interference with wildlife movement due to the barrier effects created by I-70 and the influences of alternatives is considered to be one of the most serious issues affecting wildlife in the Corridor (p. 3.2-1)."</p> <p>To support the detrimental effects that roads have on habitat fragmentation and wildlife movement we suggest the following background information be included in the Final PEIS as well as the corresponding citations:</p> <p>Habitat fragmentation is now recognized as one of the greatest threats to biodiversity and the decline of species worldwide (Ehrlich 1986; Wilcove et al. 1998) – a trend expected only to increase across the Southern Rockies (SREP 2004). Transportation infrastructure, in particular, is a significant cause of habitat fragmentation, with negative impacts on wildlife (e.g., Harris and Gallagher 1989; Mæhr 1984; Reed et al. 1996).</p> <p>Animals are frequently killed on roads (Forman et al. 2003) as they move from one part of their range to another, or they may avoid roads altogether (Gibeau and Heuer 1996; Jalkotzy et al. 1997), limiting their habitat area and ability to fulfill certain needs. The impacts are pervasive – Forman (2000) estimates that 20 percent of the land in the U.S. is directly influenced by public roadways.</p> <p>3.2.5 Wildlife Issues in the Corridor (p. 3.2-5-3.2-6)</p> <p>A. Quantitative data does exist regarding how a road's design regulates its barrier effect.</p> <p>The PEIS adequately states the barrier effect that roads, increasing development, and human intrusion have on wildlife movement. However, it inaccurately states, "No quantitative data exist regarding how a road's design regulates its barrier effect (p. 3.2-5)."</p> <p>According to Norris Dodd, et al. (2003),</p> <p>"A significant relationship between underpass crossings and traffic volume suggests that elk do not cross through either underpasses when traffic volume is greater than seven vehicles/minute." Additional research by Norris Dodd between 2003 and 2005 regarding this issue will be available in the Rockies Wildlife Crossing Field Course proceedings in Summer 2005 and should be incorporated into the final PEIS (SREP 2005).</p> <p>Other research exists on the quantitative effects roads have on particular species. For example, Noss (2002) showed that as road density increases to six miles of road per square mile, mule deer habitat falls to zero. Deer will tend to avoid areas within ¼ - ½ mile of roads, depending on traffic, road quality, and the density of cover.</p> <p>In addition to the mention of road width, retaining walls, fences, raised medians, guard rails, and increases in volume and speed of traffic (p. 3.2-5), the following factors should be cited as affecting wildlife movement and use of wildlife crossings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site characteristics of the wildlife corridor;</li> <li>• Physical structure of the passageway;</li> <li>• Location;</li> <li>• Time lag associated with species becoming aware of the crossing existence, then habituation by adults and learned use by offspring;</li> <li>• Traffic noise;</li> <li>• Light spillage;</li> <li>• Human activities in the crossing;</li> <li>• Changes in land use and development patterns;</li> <li>• Changes in species populations and movement patterns, and interspecies competition;</li> <li>• Fluctuations in food supply;</li> <li>• Climate extremes; and</li> <li>• Natural events, such as fire or flood (LSA Associates 2003).</li> </ul> <p>B. Continue the collection of Animal-Vehicle Collision data in order to inform wildlife mitigation measure placement.</p> <p>The importance of Animal-Vehicle Collision data is well stated in the Draft PEIS (p. 3.2-5). Animal-Vehicle Collision data is absolutely critical to understanding the effect the I-70 Corridor has on wildlife movement and wildlife attempting to cross the highway. In addition, it can help to inform the placement of wildlife crossing structures along the Corridor.</p> <p>SREP urges CDOT to continue the collection of Animal-Vehicle Collision data along the Corridor in order to inform the mitigation measures recommended in the Final PEIS.</p> <p>C. SREP strongly encourages CDOT to incorporate the ALVE committee's recommended wildlife mitigation measures regardless of the chosen alternative of the Final PEIS, thereby incorporating all recommended wildlife crossings into the final ROD.</p> <p>SREP would like to commend CDOT on the extensive and thoughtful recommendations of the ALVE committee on the effect of the I-70 Corridor as a barrier to wildlife as well as the development of approaches to mitigate transportation-related impacts on wildlife movement in the Corridor.</p> <p>SREP also supports CDOT in its efforts to ensure that wildlife crossings are an essential component to</p>	Written

every highway project along the I-70 corridor, as it is known to be a major barrier to wildlife movement in the state of Colorado. SREP strongly encourages CDOT to construct all of the ALIVE committee's recommended wildlife mitigation measures regardless of the chosen alternative, thereby incorporating all recommended wildlife crossings into the final ROD.

## II. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

### 3.2.3.4 Direct Wildlife Impacts (p. 3.2-11-3.2-19)

The thirteen identified Linkage Interference Zones (LIZs) and corresponding mitigation measures offer a solid foundation for alleviating the direct impacts of I-70 on wildlife. In the following comments, SREP would like to offer specific comments pertaining to each LIZ and its corresponding wildlife crossing recommendations to ensure that the most effective wildlife crossings are constructed in the Corridor.

#### Zone 1: Dotsero

A. Support the use of fencing with additional research citations.

Fencing is recommended by several investigators and shown to reduce road mortality (Lyren and Crooks 2002, FHWA 2000). Fencing is used to prevent animals from crossing roads, directing animals to cross at grade in specific locations, or to direct wildlife to overpasses and overpasses. Fencing is recommended to reduce roadkill by preventing wildlife from crossing the right-of-way at grade and to redirect movement to the crossing structures (Hartmann 2002); Fencing has been shown to reduce roadkill by 80 percent in Banff National Park (Guterman 2002).

B. Additional wildlife underpasses should be recommended in addition to fencing.

Fencing is shown to be most effective when combined with multiple crossing structures for wildlife (Clevenger 2000). Providing fencing in the Dotsero LIZ will effectively reduce Animal-Vehicle Collisions, but will not provide permeability for wildlife movement.

#### Zone 2: Eagle County Airport to Town of Eagle

A. Support increasing the openness ratio of a crossing structure with research citations.

Ideally, bigger is better when designing underpasses. Overpasses are more accommodating to more species than underpasses (Jackson and Griffin 1998). In Road Ecology, this is called the "openness ratio" where:

openness = width x height/length (Reed 1975)

Clevenger 2003 determined that the most important attribute influencing species performance ratios was structural openness. Overpasses are less confining, quieter, and have similar vegetation and ambient conditions to the surrounding habitat. Wildlife species will prefer openness to allow the animal to see the opposite end of a wildlife passage (Jackson and Griffin 1998). Even though openness is preferred, there should still be vegetation within the crossing to provide cover for smaller prey species, raptors, and invertebrates.

B. Increase the height and width of the bridge west of Cottonwood Creek to at least 14 feet and/or achieve an openness ratio of .9, making it more suitable for a deer and elk crossing.

The Forest Service's "Wildlife Crossing Toolkit" recommends a minimum .9 openness ratio for deer crossing structures (<http://www.wildlifecrossings.info/sa014.htm>). In the 1970s Reed, et al. suggested that a height and width of about 14 feet was needed to provide the necessary feeling of openness for deer (Reed 1975). In Colorado underpasses designed for deer had an openness index of 0.31, and mule deer were reluctant to use it (Reed 1975). Additional studies have found that mule deer were not as reluctant to use structures with openness indices between about 4.6 and 5.6 (Ward 1982).

Corresponding data for elk is not yet available, but Norris Dodd and Jeff Gagnon of the Arizona Game and Fish Department have shown that elk tend to prefer structures with a higher openness ratio and are reluctant to use long, narrow tunnel-like structures. For example, along US highway 260, Dodd and Gagnon found the elk passage rate to be 25% higher in a crossing structure with a 12.3 openness ratio, than a crossing structure with a 5.5 openness ratio. The structures were virtually side-by-side along the highway and provided a unique opportunity to evaluate elk preference between the two structures (Gagnon pers. comm.).

#### Zone 3: Eagle to Wolcott

A. Ensure new wildlife underpasses have a minimum openness ratio of .9

B. Provide multiple smaller culverts and tunnels with ramps for small mammals instead of jersey barrier gaps.

Best management practices to ensure safe passage for small mammals consist of smaller culverts and ramps during the wet season as opposed to sending wildlife across the road and through median barrier gaps.

When highways bisect wetland habitats small diameter culverts or equalizer pipes are used to prevent the buildup of water in the road subgrade and prevent potential erosion of road fill material. During periods when the culverts carry water most animal use is prohibited. In order to provide a travel corridor for small mammals when these pipes contain water, small mammal ramps can be installed into new or existing pipes (MDOT Guidelines).

#### Zone 4: Wolcott to Avon

A. Ensure new wildlife crossing structures have a minimum openness ratio of .9

B. Connect new wildlife crossing structures with game fencing to ensure permeability and reduce Animal-Vehicle Collisions.

#### Zone 5: Dowd Canyon

A. Consider constructing a span bridge to replace the concrete box culvert at mp 171.7

Span bridges offer a high openness ratio for wildlife while maintaining the structure of the landscape, keeping drainages, rivers, and watersheds intact.

#### Zone 6a and 6b: Upper and Lower West Vail Pass

A. Construct at least one vegetated overpass at West Vail Pass. Independent Studies identify West Vail Pass as a critical wildlife linkage and suggest the construction of a wildlife overpass in conjunction with wildlife fencing to accommodate the most species. The Wildlands Project Room to Romam campaign identified Vail Pass as the most endangered linkage in the Southern Rockies ([www.wildlandsproject.org/cms/page1177.ctm](http://www.wildlandsproject.org/cms/page1177.ctm)).

In addition, the Forest Service states the following re: Upper Black Gore Creek to Vail Pass:

There is about a four-mile stretch of I-70 here that has not provided for wildlife movement. This is the area where a lynx was recently killed by traffic and this area is considered important for the species natural dispersion. We suggest considering designing at least two overpasses in this area in conjunction with fencing to provide for safe passage of lynx and other wildlife. One suggested area is between the two Black Lakes, another area is west of Black Lake Two near where the lynx was killed. Designing wildlife overpasses in this area will present considerable engineering challenges, especially since I-70 splits in two places here (USDA Forest Service letter dated April 11, 1999).

The following species use was documented in the east and west Vail Pass area: Mule Deer, Elk, Coyote, Mountain Lion, Moose, American Marten, Snowshoe Hare (Barnum 2003).

#### Zone 7: East Vail Pass to Copper Mountain

A. Ensure new wildlife crossing structures have a minimum openness ratio of .9

#### Zone 8: Officers Gulch/Owl Canyon

A. Ensure new wildlife crossing structures have a minimum openness ratio of .9

B. Construct multiple small mammal culverts throughout LIZ to ensure permeability for wildlife utilizing Tenmile Creek, Officers Gulch Pond and Uneva Lake.

#### Zone 9a: Laskey Gulch

A. Investigate constructing a span bridge to replace existing 5' by 5' CMP at Laskey Gulch.

#### Zone 9b: Hamilton Gulch/Dead Coon Gulch

A. Ensure new wildlife crossing structures have a minimum openness ratio of .9

B. Construct multiple small mammal culverts and crossing structures throughout LIZ to ensure permeability for wildlife utilizing Straight Creek and wetland areas to the south.

#### Zone 10: Herman Gulch/Bakerville

A. Construct multiple boreal toad crossing structures at Herman Gulch.

Concrete walls leading to multiple culverts and pipes can ensure safe passage for amphibians and reptiles (FHWA Critter Crossings, <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/wildlifecrossings/amphibin.htm>). Guide walls lead amphibians to crossing structures and constructing multiple structures between guide walls will ensure that amphibians have multiple options when crossing I-70.

Zone 11: East of Empire on US 40

No Comments.

Zone 12: Fall River

A. Ensure new wildlife crossing structures have a minimum openness ratio of .9

B. The PEIS should note that this LZ is close to the location of the June 2004 wolf roadkill.

Although this LZ is not the exact location of the June 2004 wolf roadkill, the following is worth noting:

On June 7, 2004, the first documented wolf to enter Colorado since 1936 was killed near the Dumont exit of I-70, close to the Fall River LZ. The wolf was a female from the Swan Lake Yellowstone pack, most likely dispersing to start a new territory and looking for a mate. She had traveled over 500 miles to her ultimate demise on I-70.

Zone 13: Mount Vernon Canyon

No Comments.

3.3.3.1 General Impact Types and Effects: Direct Impacts: Barrier Effect: Large Mammals (p. 3.3-12 – 3.3-13)

A. A full citation for the ALIVE Memoranda does not exist. Details about the Memoranda are requested.

SREP applauds the ALIVE committee's recognition that the:

"Impacts from the barrier effect on large mammals without additional crossing structures and wildlife fencing would be considered substantial (ALIVE Group Memoranda 2003) (p. 3.3-12)."

When looking up the full citation of this Memoranda for more information, it was not found in the reference list. More information about the status of this Memoranda, and its full intent and recommendations would add clarity and detail to the Final PEIS.

B. A full suite of wildlife crossings, including at-grade and above-grade crossings in addition to below-grade crossings should be considered for large mammals.

The PEIS states that:

"The addition of below-grade crossing structures within the linkage interference zones identified by the ALIVE process would improve crossing opportunities in certain key locations (p. 3.3-13)."

This statement is incorrect because the ALIVE committee recommends at-grade and above-grade crossing structures in addition to below-grade structures. Utilizing the greatest diversity of crossing structures, including span bridges, underpasses and overpasses, will increase permeability for wildlife.

3.3.3.1 General Impact Types and Effects: Direct Impacts: Barrier Effect: Birds and Bats (p. 3.3-13)

A. The PEIS should state that crossing structures, including underpasses and overpasses, can assist birds and bats in safe passage across roadways.

The PEIS states that:

"Impacts on birds and bats from the barrier effect are generally expected to be negligible. Barrier effects from the Corridor that could potentially affect flyers would include direct mortality from colliding with vehicles, behavioral avoidance of the area due to high levels of disturbance, or behavioral avoidance of open areas (p. 3.3-13)."

A substantial number of diurnal and nocturnal raptors collide with vehicles along roads and highways, and are therefore not negligible. On highway 160 east of Durango, eagles and owls have been documented as the cause for Animal-Vehicle Collisions. Overpass and underpasses with vegetation can provide habitat and crossing opportunities for raptors and other bird species.

3.3 Threatened, Endangered, and Other Special Status Animal and Plant Species: Canada Lynx (p. 3.3-14)

A. The PEIS understates the substantial effect of direct highway mortality on the Southern Rockies Canada Lynx population and should cite CDOW roadkill data.

Because the Canada Lynx is a threatened species and its population numbers are still low, direct mortality and roadkill have an extremely significant impact on the existence of a viable lynx population in the Southern Rockies, and in Colorado. The surrounding habitat along the I-70 Corridor is documented to be good lynx habitat with lynx being identified in the White River National Forest and surrounding areas (CDOW 2005).

According to the 2001 Progress report, "Human-caused mortality factors such as gunshot and vehicle collision are the highest cause of death for lynx > 8 months post-release (CDOW 2001)."

Even more striking, is that according to the February 2005 CDOW Progress Report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 7 out of the 61 lynx mortalities from 1999-2004 were due to roadkill, representing over 10% of lynx mortalities.

4.4.2 Wildlife Habitat and TES Species (p. 4-10).

A. The PEIS should fully cite the Southern Rockies Wildlands Network Vision in the References.

SREP is pleased that CDOT utilized data and information from SREP's Southern Rockies Wildlands Network Vision under the Cumulative Impacts section. No full citation was found in the PEIS "Reference" section.

Please cite fully, as:

Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project, The Denver Zoological Foundation and The Wildlands Project 2003. Southern Rockies Wildlands Network Vision. Colorado Mountain Club: Golden, Colorado.

### III. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, SREP would like to commend the ALIVE committee for its thoughtful recommendations to reduce the barrier effect on wildlife. We would also like to reiterate our commitment to wildlife crossings and lending any support we can to CDOT to ensure that all the recommended crossing structures along the I-70 Corridor are fully funded and constructed to increase permeability for Colorado's wildlife.

Again, SREP strongly encourages CDOT to incorporate these wildlife mitigation measures in the final ROD, regardless of the chosen alternative.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this crucial project and please feel free to contact me if you have any comments or questions at 720.946.9653 or [monique@RestoreTheRockies.org](mailto:monique@RestoreTheRockies.org).

Sincerely,

Monique DiGiorgio, Executive Director  
Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project

Categorized Comment	596	Donoho, Stephanie	Public	5/24/2005	<p>The historic mountain communities of Idaho Springs, Georgetown, Empire and Silver Plume, contain valuable, uncountable resources that will be lost if the preferred alternative proceeds. This nationally recognized heritage area must be protected and preserved, to maintain the unique character that is the Rocky Mountain region of Colorado.</p> <p>Clear Creek County residents and businesses cannot sustain the direct impact to their environment, health, economic livelihoods, and that this large scale construction project will create. You are sacrificing an entire community and tens of thousands of people who call the area home to create an alternative that will be outdated and at maximum capacity, before it is even completed.</p> <p>Go back to the drawing board. Do more work. Look at mass transit options more carefully. There are options that have not yet been considered, and we can't consider them in hindsight once the character of these communities has been destroyed.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	817	Dowden, Charles	Public	7/7/2005	<p>As a driver who spent a LONG time in a LONG line of traffic headed up Interstate 70 for the 4th of July, I am once again reminded of how much we need the monorail from Denver to the mountains. I thought it was bad on six weekends, but July 4th weekend was a not-so-gentle reminder that it happens every weekend. The mountains are the playground for Coloradans and many out-of-staters, but the drive up I-70 is discouraging to all of us. Patience wears thin, and the environmental damage is off the charts. Anyone who thinks the problem will be relieved by adding another lane of traffic is joking themselves. The cost, traffic tie-ups, environmental damage, etc. is staggering. It would be nice if a solution was found and implemented before the baby boomers like me are too old to get out and enjoy the mountains. I believe the AGS system is the answer.</p>	Online

Categorized Comment	640	League of Women Voters of Jefferson County	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/20/2005	<p>The League of Women Voters Jefferson County, Colorado 1426 Brentwood Street, Suite 7 Lakewood, CO 80214 303238-0032 www.lwjefco.org</p> <p>May 20, 2005</p> <p>Ms. Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region I 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011</p> <p>The League of Women Voters of Jefferson County believes that a balanced multi-modal transportation system should be our goal, as a county and as a state. We also believe that preservation of Colorado's natural beauty and concern as to how future land use is influenced should be high priorities in transportation design.</p> <p>In considering the I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), particularly proposals for the segment in Jefferson County, suggestions in the PEIS for immediate actions include adding a climbing lane in the Mt. Vernon Canyon to alleviate congestion. However, congestion primarily occurs on Friday evening and Saturday and Sunday mornings, probably a maximum of four hours on each of those days. The cost in dollars, degradation of the beauty of this major canyon entrance to our mountains and the disruption of the traffic flow during construction are enormous, especially when there already exists a lightly-used 2-lane alternative (U.S. 40) in the canyon. We oppose construction of an additional lane in Mt. Vernon Canyon.</p> <p>Might it be possible to use U.S. 40 as a 2-lane, one-way route for "slow-moving traffic" in those peak hours only? It should be clearly posted and detour that traffic off of I-70 at exit 259, as is currently done when I-70 has to be closed in bad weather due to poor traction and accidents. The negative side would be a temporary inconvenience to a very few mountain residents who would have to find a route other than U.S. 40 if needing to drive off of the mountain during those hours. Given the alternative (construction of a climbing lane on I-70) few would object.</p> <p>Proposed traffic mitigation work at curves and interchanges in Jefferson County should use minimum additional land and keep disruption of land to a minimum, maintaining true concern for the beauty of our mountains and seeking the most efficient ways to improve traffic flow in congested areas.</p> <p>The long-range 20-year goal should be the concurrent development of alternative forms of transportation in addition to, and operating in a separate guideway from, the automobile. These should not be precluded by any interim construction in the corridor. Developing ridership for such alternatives can begin immediately by encouraging the use of improved bus service from Denver International Airport, and from the Jefferson County Government Center on weekends for those who are recreation-bound. This could be managed either by the Colorado Department of Transportation, the various recreation-destination areas or by contracting out to private companies, building on services already in place.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Marian Downs, President Jefferson County League of Women Voters</p> <p>cc: Chris Paulsen Jean Wallace</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	433	Drake, Barbara	Public	4/9/2005	<p>I am opposed to any widening of I 70 through the Glenwood Canyon. The current road is a work of wonder and should be left alone. The river, mountains, air, water, and wildlife would all suffer with more lanes of traffic flowing through our precious mountains. Leave the road as it is.</p> <p>It is time to bite the bullet and provide our state with a High Speed Elevated train rather than additional lanes of car traffic. Take into account all things, not just the "easiest" way to things or the "what has been done before" method.</p> <p>Please use environmental criteria in the final screening and analysis instead of capital cost only. Yes, the elevated rail would cost more than more lanes, but the current traffic would be completely unneffected by the construction. Tourism would not be "slowed" down. We might even bring in more if Colorado's CDOT shows the world that we are a forward thinking state. Use alternative sources of energy for the train as well. Do not use oil or coal, preferably electric.</p> <p>No matter what you do, the cost will be huge. I as a Colorado tax payer WANT to pay more in taxes in order to have a clean alternative into our mountains. We need to start doing something about it now, not hundreds of years from now.</p> <p>Barbara Drake</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	334	Drapeau, Katherine	Public	3/14/2005	<p>I would like to comment on figure 3.12-4, on page 3.12-9 (Chapter 3, section 12 - noise). This figure is titled "Georgetown Cross-Section View". This cross section is drawn across the valley at the point of the Georgetown Loop Railroad depot. This location is quite a bit west of the southwest end of Georgetown. There are only 3 or 4 cabins in this area, used as summer homes. Therefore I think that the entire noise evaluation regarding Georgetown should be disregarded as incorrect. I would ask that the noise readings be re-done, this time IN Georgetown.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	406	Drury, Joan	Counties	2/26/2005	<p>Good afternoon, I'm Joan Drury, I'm a Clear Creek County commissioner and a fifth-generation Clear Creek County native. I would like to take this opportunity to speak about the vision of the I-70 corridor.</p> <p>To begin with, this draft PEIS does not address a 50-year transportation plan; the plan only addresses 15 to 20 years of construction of expanding asphalt. Every alternative that did not fall within the \$4 billion cost range was eliminated. CDOT, by its own admission, will tell you that by 2025, when construction should be finished, I-70 traffic will be backed up just the way it is on the weekends now, and then also during the weekdays. That is the vision for our future.</p> <p>Think, if you will, how that backup on I-70 during the construction period will affect you here in Winter Park. Should one traffic lane alone be closed partially or for a time being during the construction phase on I-70, US 40 will become the route of choice. You might think, Great, look at the business that might develop. Think again how many skiers and others will get in line for the three- or four-hour trip along I-70 from Denver and then turn on Highway 40 along with the truck traffic to make it to your ski area in another two hours or so?</p> <p>I ask you, the residents, business owners, and those who make Winter Park their destination area, who will do that, coming and going and for how long will Winter Park continue to be the destination for these people? Perhaps Durango or perhaps Utah for out-of-state travelers becoming more desirable places to recreate.</p> <p>I would ask you to consider building the monorail first. That will remove hundreds of cars from I-70. And two, to develop and implement an alternative route, perhaps up Highway 285 and in the back door to the ski areas. Will this hurt Winter Park and Grand County economically? I would say no. Your visitors will continue to have a quality recreational experience, be they skiers, hunters, boaters, fishermen, or tourists.</p> <p>Think about your quality of life, your driving, and your future. Please ask yourselves, Does this transportation plan with its many negative impacts address a 50-year vision for your county and mine as well as the state of Colorado? Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	145	Drury, Joan	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Good evening, Thank you for coming. Thank you to all the people from Clear Creek County that are in attendance tonight. I'm going to just be short. I'm going to give the rest of my time to Jo Ann Sorensen, should she need it.</p> <p>One of the things I would like to ask is that the review period be extended. This, as has been pointed out, we didn't get this document until after December the 10th, and we were supposed to have it the 10th and didn't get it until much later. It's a massive document, for those of you who haven't seen it.</p> <p>It says I think the -- in your bylaws or your rules that it's supposed to be easily understood by the average person. I think I have average intelligence, but I tell you, it takes a long time just to get through this thing. And I have yet to get through it. So I would really ask that you give it more time.</p> <p>And also, I'd like to say that -- I've made this comment before -- that by drawing a line in the sand saying \$4 billion is what we can afford, that might be looking forward from a monetary point of view, it is not looking forward therefore in Clear Creek County and it has a good outcome not only for us but for the rest of the corridor.</p> <p>I don't think you will find people in Vail or Summit County that want to end up with all these parking lots and people that they can't do anything with; they're going to use much of their valued property for parking lots rather than rental dollars that would come into them.</p>	Transcripts



I would also like to say this 15-year construction period is not tolerable by any stretch of the imagination. Our county cannot survive this type of economic downturn. Even by the figures that I have seen, and I think Cecelia pointed out one time, those are regional figures that show what the economy will do across the corridor.

If you look at Clear Creek County, we are just flat-lined right straight through. Our county is a struggling county. We try to provide the best services that we can, but we are very limited and this is going to limit them even more.

So we're down to one that you once again give us more time to look and make detailed comments from our residents and from our various boards, historical society, consulting parties and others.

And I thank you for your time. Thank you so much.

Categorized Comment	806	Drury, Joan	Public	2/26/2005	<p>GOOD AFTERNOON! I AM JOAN DRURY, CLEAR CREEK COUNTY COMMISSIONER, AND A 5TH GENERATION COLORADO NATIVE. I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK ABOUT THE VISION OF THE I-70 CORRIDOR.</p> <p>TO BEGIN WITH THIS DRAFT PEIS DOES NOT ADDRESS A 50 YEAR TRANSPORTATION PLAN. THE PLAN ONLY ADDRESSES 15 TO 20 YEARS OF CONSTRUCTION OF EXPANDING ASPHALT. EVERY ALTERNATIVE THAT DID NOT FALL WITHIN THE 4 BILLION DOLLAR COST RANGE WAS ELIMINATED.</p> <p>CDOT BY ITS OWN ADMISSION WILL TELL YOU THAT BY 2025 WHEN CONSTRUCTION SHOULD BE FINISHED I-70 TRAFFIC WILL BE BACKED UP JUST THE WAY IT IS ON WEEKENDS NOW, AND THEN ALSO DURING THE WEEK DAYS. THAT IS THE VISION FOR OUR FUTURE?</p> <p>THINK IF YOU WILL, HOW THAT BACK UP ON I-70 DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PERIOD WILL EFFECT YOU HERE IN WINTERPARK. SHOULD ONE TRAFFIC LANE ALONE BE CLOSED DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE ON I-70 U.S 40 WILL BECOME THE ROUTE OF CHOICE. YOU MIGHT SAY "GREAT; LOOK AT THE BUSINESS THAT MIGHT DEVELOP. THINK AGAIN. HOW MANY SKIERS AND OTHERS WILL GET IN LINE FOR A 3 OR 4 HOUR TRIP ALONG I-70 FROM DENVER AND THEN TURN ON HWY 40 ALONG WITH THE TRUCK TRAFFIC TO MAKE IT TO YOUR SKI AREA IN ANOTHER 2 HOURS? I ASK YOU THE RESIDENTS, BUSINESS OWNERS AND THOSE WHO MAKE WINTERPARK THEIR DESTINATION AREA WHO WILL DO THAT COMING AND GOING AND FOR HOW LONG WILL WINTERPARK CONTINUE TO BE THE DESTINATION FOR THESE PEOPLE? PERHAPS DURANGO PERHAPS UTAH FOR OUT OF STATE TRAVELERS BECOME MORE DESIRABLE PLACES TO RECREATE.</p> <p>I WOULD ASK YOU TO CONSIDER 1. BUILDING OF THE MONORAIL FIRST. THAT WILL REMOVE HUNDREDS OF CARS FROM I-70. AND THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AN ALTERNATIVE ROUTE PERHAPS UP HWY 285 AND IN THE BACK DOOR OF THE SKI AREAS. WILL THIS HURT WINTERPARK AND GRAND COUNTY ECONOMICALLY? I WOULD SAY "NO" YOUR VISITORS WILL CONTINUE TO HAVE A QUALITY RECREATIONAL EXPERIENCE BE THEY SKIERS HUNTERS, BOATERS AND FISHERMEN OR TOURISTS.</p> <p>THINK ABOUT YOUR QUALITY OF LIFE, YOUR ECONOMY, YOUR FUTURE. PLEASE ASK YOURSELVES DOES THIS TRANSPORTATION PLAN WITH ITS MANY NEGATIVE IMPACTS ADDRESS A 50 YEAR VISION FOR YOUR COUNTY AND MINE AS WELL AS THE STATE OF COLORADO.</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
Categorized Comment	803	Drury-Murphy, Gayle	Public	2/26/2005	<p>HELLO,</p> <p>MY NAME IS GAYLE DRURY-MURPHY - MY FAMILY HELPED SETTLE CLEAR CREEK COUNTY IN 1870. I AM A FIFTH GENERATION NATIVE OF COLORADO AND LIVE IN CLEAR CREEK COUNTY BY CHOICE. I REPRESENT MY FAMILY AND THE MILL CREEK VALLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY, A SECTION 106 CONSULTING PARTY.</p> <p>THE PROPOSED WIDENING OF I-70 HAS ALREADY BEGUN TO TAKE ITS TOLL ON CLEAR CREEK COUNTY. WHILE IT MAY BE SEVERAL YEARS BEFORE THE FIRST SHOVEL FULL OF DIRT IS REMOVED, WE ARE FEELING THREATENED AND DISPLACED. THERE ARE MANY WHO WONDER IF THEY SHOULD PUT THEIR HOMES OR BUSINESSES ON THE MARKET NOW BEFORE THE BOTTOM FALLS OUT OF CLEAR CREEK COUNTY ECONOMICALLY.</p> <p>NOW, MAY I ASK YOU TO PONDER THESE SCENARIOS: IF A HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT WAS PROPOSED THAT WOULD COME THROUGH YOUR COMMUNITY AND TAKE TWO TO FIVE YEARS TO COMPLETE, YOU'D BE DISTURBED, BUT IF IT WAS A WELL THOUGHT OUT AND RESPONSIBLY PLANNED PROJECT, YOU WOULD PROBABLY BE ABLE TO JUSTIFY THE MEANS TO AN END, AND YOU'D GET THROUGH IT. BUT, IF A PROPOSAL CAME ALONG LENGTHENING THAT CONSTRUCTION PERIOD TO POSSIBLY FIFTEEN YEARS, THAT SEEMED TO IGNORE PRUDENT ALTERNATIVES, YOU'D THINK QUITE SERIOUSLY ABOUT THE RAMIFICATIONS OF THIS PROJECT ON YOU, YOUR FAMILY AND YOUR COMMUNITY.</p> <p>PERHAPS YOU HAVE A YOUNG FAMILY, OR YOUR CHILDREN ARE ACTIVE IN SCHOOL ATHLETICS OR EXTRACURRICULAR PROGRAMS, THE THOUGHT OF LIVING WITH THIS NIGHTMARE FOR OVER A DECADE IS ABHORRENT. IF THIS IS YOUR CHOSEN RETIREMENT HOME, YOU QUICKLY REALIZE THAT YOU WILL LITERALLY BE SPENDING THE REST OF YOUR LIFE LIVING IN A CONSTRUCTION ZONE.</p> <p>MAYBE YOU CHOOSE TO LIVE IN CLEAR CREEK COUNTY BUT MUST DRIVE EAST OR WEST ON I-70 DAILY. BUT, YOUR ROUTINE CHANGES DRASTICALLY; AND REMEMBER THIS IS A DAILY REALITY THAT COULD GO ON FOR FIFTEEN YEARS. WITH THE SCOPE AND LENGTH OF THIS CONSTRUCTION "ALTERNATIVE", EVERY CARTRIP IS A JAW CLENCHER; SITTING IN YOUR YARD AT HOME IS UNBEARABLE BECAUSE OF THE NOISE, AIR POLLUTION AND VISUAL WRECKAGE OUR WILDLIFE INCLUDING THE BIG HORNED SHEEP THAT ARE ALWAYS VISIBLE ALONG THE ROAD AND HILLSIDE WILL SURELY SUFFER THE NOISE AND AIR POLLUTANTS EFFECTS.</p> <p>HISTORIC STRUCTURES, RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, FAVORITE FISHING HOLES AND HIKING AND BIKING TRAILS ARE ISOLATED. WHY? BECAUSE THEY ARE MITIGATED, MEANING SOUND WALLS, CONCRETE BARRIERS, PILES OF DIRT, MOUNTAINS OF DEBRIS, VISUAL CHAOS - IN OTHER WORDS: A WAR ZONE. DESTRUCTION OF THE COLORADO OUR FOREFATHERS DREAMED FOR US. THESE AREN'T UNIQUE MOUNTAIN COMMUNITIES ANY LONGER - SOON, ALL WE WILL HAVE IS A CORRIDOR. THIS IS I-70.</p> <p>WE TAKE PRIDE IN THE FACT THAT CLEAR CREEK COUNTY IS SO STEEPED IN HISTORY. MANY OF US FEEL IT TO BE A WELCOMING GATEWAY TO THE HIGH ROCKIES AND A TRUE COLORADO EXPERIENCE. MANY OF US LOVE DENVER AND OTHER CITIES, TOWNS, AND RECREATIONAL AND THE SCENIC BEAUTY ALL ACROSS THE STATE. WE ARE INTERESTED IN THE WELL-BEING OF THE ENTIRE STATE OF COLORADO. WE ARE THE PROTECTORS, CONSERVATIONISTS, AND VISIONARIES FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS, PLEASE WORK WITH US.</p> <p>THANK YOU.</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
Categorized Comment	124	Drury-Murphy, Gayle	Public	1/12/2005	<p>My name is Gayle Drury-Murphy. I'm a board member of the Mill Creek Valley Historical Society, a Section 106 consulting party, and we're located in Dumont, Colorado. I'm also a fifth-generation Clear Creek County native.</p> <p>As residents of Clear Creek County, certainly on many of our minds is that alternative routes were not given the attention and consideration they should have had. Apparently, only I-70's expansion, with all the problems and future detrimental ramifications, was and is the only consideration of CDOT.</p> <p>Tourism is the key industry and lifeblood of Clear Creek County. Who will leave an interstate highway to visit a museum or historical structure surrounded and blighted by construction equipment and supplies? Who will want to spend the time in a wonderful museum in Idaho Springs, Georgetown, or Silver Plume and the ambience that being in - other Clear Creek County communities managed to restore after I-70 ripped through them in the late '60s? And now it will be further flooded.</p> <p>And who here has 10 to 20 years of life to wait for some semblance of normality to return to his or her hometown?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	405	Drury-Murphy, Gayle	Public	2/26/2005	<p>Hello. My name is Gayle Drury-Murphy. My family helped settle Clear Creek County. They came there in the 1870s. I'm a fifth-generation native to Colorado, and I live in Clear Creek County by choice. I represent my family and the Mill Creek Valley Historical Society, of which we are a Section 106 consulting party.</p> <p>The proposed widening of I-70 has already begun to take its toll on Clear Creek County. While it may be several years before the first shovel of dirt is removed, we're feeling threatened and displaced. There are many who wonder if they should put their homes on the market now or sell their businesses before the bottom falls out of Clear Creek County economically.</p>	Transcripts

Now, I ask you to ponder these scenarios: If a highway construction project was proposed that would come through your community and take two to five years to complete, you'd be disturbed. But if it was a well thought out and responsibly planned project, you would probably be able to justify it as a means to an end, and you'd get through it. But if a proposal came along lengthening that construction period to possibly 15 years and seemed to ignore prudent alternatives, you'd think quite seriously about the ramifications of this project on you, your family, and your community.

Perhaps you have a young family or your children are active in school athletics or extracurricular programs. The thought of living with this nightmare for over a decade is abhorrent. If this is your chosen retirement home, you quickly realize that you will literally be spending the rest of your life living in a construction zone.

Maybe you choose to live in Clear Creek County but must drive east or west on I-70 daily. But your routine changes drastically, and remember, this is a daily reality that could go on for 15 years. With the scope and length of this construction alternative, every car trip is a jaw clencher. Sitting in your yard at home is unbearable because of the noise, air pollution, and visual wreckage. Our wildlife, including bighorn sheep that are always visible along the roadways and hillsides, will surely suffer the noise and air pollution effects.

Historic structures, recreational facilities, favorite fishing holes, and hiking and biking trails are isolated. Why? Because they are mitigated; meaning sound walls, concrete barriers, piles of dirt, mountains of debris, visual chaos. In other words, it's a war zone, destruction of the Colorado our forefathers dreamed for us. These aren't the unique mountain communities any longer. Soon all we have is the corridor because this is I-70.

We take pride in the fact that Clear Creek County is so steeped in history. Many of us feel it's the welcoming gateway to the high Rockies and a true Colorado experience. Many of us love Denver and other cities and towns and recreational and the scenic beauty all across the state, and we are interested in the well-being of the entire state of Colorado. We are the protectors, conservationists, visionaries for future generations. Please work with us.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	734	Duffy, JoAnn	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action - fix 'choke' points, modify travel demand (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Unless the tourists capacity is increased in Summit County, there will be no place to accommodate the folk that arrive here.. We should realize the limits of capacity on our environment.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	704	Duling, Brian	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action - fix 'choke' points, modify travel demand (\$1.3 billion), Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>'If you build it they will come.' More cars will encourage more cars. A focal point like Summit county needs a long-term public transportation. The Summit Stage is a model.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	199	Durrett, Jacqueline	Public	2/18/2005	<p>My husband and I do not agree with the idea of making I-70 a six lane highway through the mountains. The corridor is already crowded and full of traffic. The pristine beauty of the corridor that we remember from our younger days is gone forever. However, we still believe an attempt should be made to save the remaining beauty and animal habitat from further destruction. Paving more of the corridor is not the answer. It may be less expensive than implementing alternative transportation, but money isn't everything. We strongly support the use of passenger rail through the corridor. Let's finally take a lesson from the Europeans and use railroads to move lots of people very efficiently. They have certainly used mass transportation for years and have found that it makes economic sense and esthetic sense too. Jacqueline and Richard Durrett</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	68	Eaton, Julie L.	Public	1/12/2005	<p>I would like to see a noise pollution survey done for the north side of Dumont. I find it a little fishy that this has been left out so far. This is probably one of the noisiest areas in the county.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	236	Edeen, Jessie	Public	1/26/2005	<p>Hi. My names is Jessie Edeen, and I live at 2374 Elliott Road.</p> <p>And I wasn't going to comment tonight, but I guess the thing that really came across to me tonight that I'm most concerned about, you know, we all want the highways to be safe, we all want to be able to travel happily and healthily, but to me, it's a quality-of-life issue. It is a community.</p> <p>I live in West Vail. My family has lived in West Vail for five generations, so they were there before the interstate. They were there before. And I'd like, as you're addressing this, to not just address that it's asphalt, that it's fast, it's safe, how much it costs, but remember that these are going through communities, communities where people live, communities that I'd like my children to continue to live in, my grandchild.</p> <p>And sometimes not the most economic feasible is the best -- is the best issue. I remember my father talking about where they wanted to put I-70 through Vail when they first started. And maybe there was some vision lacking then. You know, if they would have put it where some people wanted it on the north side of the interstate or the north side of the valley instead of right in the heart of it, maybe we would have had a more cohesive community. I don't know. But I hope that we look at those issues now that we may have overlooked -- let's see, 30 years ago when I-70 was put through in Vail Valley.</p> <p>And remember it's not just getting the cars from this spot to that spot, but people live in those particular communities, and maybe the issue in Vail isn't the same issue in Idaho Springs, but it requires a lot of personal attention. And I hope you all keep that in mind.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	346	Edwards, Glen	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/16/2005	<p>Good evening, I'm Glen Edwards, and I'm a longtime resident of Golden as well as a university emeritus professor from Colorado School of Mines.</p> <p>I'm speaking tonight on behalf of David Nickum, who had to leave before he could speak. David is the executive director of Colorado Trout Unlimited. I'm serving currently as the president of the West Denver chapter of Trout Unlimited. My chapter represents about 900 people. David's statewide organization represents 8,600 people.</p> <p>And I'll briefly read on what I have prepared. It's an important portion of a proposal by faculty of an institution renowned for its education related to minerals and energy. I have often lamented the damage done to the Clear Creek watershed by early mining efforts. I've forgiven these early transgressions on the basis of naivete and ignorance. Future development can no longer claim such naivete nor ignorance.</p> <p>We must protect what is left of the very thing that brings people to Colorado, our natural resources as exemplified by Clear Creek and the other streams impacted by an I-70 expansion. The Eagle, the Blue, and the Gore, et cetera. Current winter operations along I-70 are creating water quality issues right now.</p> <p>Expansion of this corridor will certainly magnify these problems and make an environmental hazard. Only within the last three years have there been serious attempts to restore the Clear Creek watershed to even a semblance of its original condition. With only modest attempts at restoration, Clear Creek had become a popular and productive cold water fishery.</p> <p>This stream is readily accessed by anyone in the metropolitan area and sees extensive use in spite of the heavy impact already made by I-70. Expanding the I-70 corridor must not ignore the value of this recreational resource. CDOT terminated the stream and wetland environmental enhanced program which would have been in the PEIS. There are threatened greenback cutthroats identified in this watershed which are not even addressed.</p> <p>Certainly, expanding I-70 on a criterion of least cost is as short-sighted as was the vision of our hard rock mining ancestors. Several precedents for environmentally sound highway expansions already exist and should be emulated. Construction of I-70 through Glenwood Canyon, for example. Construction of the highway between Basalt and Aspen were completed with fine protections for the resources.</p> <p>Responsible expansion can be done, and I'm requesting that CDOT make a genuine effort. Specifically, this PEIS does not identify the damage that will be done to watershed by expansion.</p>	Transcripts

Categorized Comment	804	Edwards, Glen	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Public Hearing on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Expansion of the I-70 Corridor</p> <p>February 16, 2005 Golden, CO</p> <p>Good afternoon, I am Glen Edwards, a long-time resident of Golden, as well as a University Emeritus Professor of the Colorado School of Mines. I wish to provide comments on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Expansion of the I-70 Corridor.</p> <p>As an ardent outdoorsman, as well as a faculty member of an institution renowned for its education related to minerals and energy, I have often lamented the damage done to the Clear Creek watershed by our early mining efforts. I have forgiven these early transgressions on the basis of naiveté and ignorance. Future development can no longer claim naiveté or ignorance. We must protect what is left of the very thing that brings people to Colorado: our natural resources as exemplified by Clear Creek and the other streams impacted by an I-70 expansion (the Eagle, the Blue, Gore, etc.).</p> <p>Only within the last few years have there been serious attempts to restore the Clear Creek watershed to a semblance of its original condition. With only modest attempts at restoration, Clear Creek has become a popular and productive cold-water fishery. This mountain stream is readily accessed by anyone in the metropolitan area, and sees extensive use, in spite of the heavy impact already made by I-70. Expanding the I-70 Corridor must not ignore the value of this recreational resource.</p> <p>Certainly, expanding I-70 on a criterion of least cost is as shortsighted as was the vision of our hard-rock mining ancestors. Several precedents for environmentally sound highway expansions already exist and should be emulated. Construction of I-70 through Glenwood Canyon has maintained an excellent trout fishery in the Colorado River, and provided a scenic drive that qualifies as a tourist attraction. Much of the added cost for this I-70 construction can be attributed to the foot-dragging and litigation surrounding the planning for construction. More recently, expansion of the highway between Basalt and Aspen was completed with excellent protection of the Roaring Fork River. Responsible expansion can be done. I am requesting that CDOT make a genuine effort to establish environmentally sound alternatives for the expansion of the I-70 Corridor. The current Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement does not establish credibility for CDOT, nor does it provide protection for watersheds that are precious resources for generations to come.</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
Categorized Comment	35	Elias, J. R.	Public	1/11/2005	<p>Expansion of I-70</p> <p>As a resident of Vail from 1968-1998 and now retired in Denver. I was an active member of tourism, not just for the western slope but also for the State. I still frequently travel to Vail as I have children living in Vail. I cannot even count the times we traveled over Loveland pass to get to Denver before Eisenhower tunnel was built. Eisenhower was the golden door to the success of the mountain resorts. We waited with baited breath for Eisenhower's completion. I have thought back many times of how great it would be to have a monorail that traveled to Silverthorne, Dillon, Vail - along the I-70 corridor, and why we did not do this all those years ago. I have traveled this stretch of road for more than 30 years and I believe this is one area we can capitalize on as a State. I know the expansion of the road is greatly needed, but what would enhance this plan would be to include space for a monorail system. Yes, the cost is high, but the payoff that would result year after year would pay it off.</p> <p>It would increase tourism to the mountains year round and for the mountain residents it would allow them easy access to Denver. To have another option besides driving or Greyhound. No traffic to contend with, weather conditions to worry about, gas to buy, less traffic produces fewer accidents. Could you imagine fly into DIA and being able to catch the monorail for your skiing vacation and not have to rent a car to drive up. I just think we are not allowing ourselves as a Great State to see and have the vision for the future. It is the pioneering spirit that this state thrives on and this option needs to be re-examined to the fullest extent. Please re-consider and include the monorail in your plans for expansion. Coloradans are visionaries. The benefits outweigh the cost/risk in the long run.</p> <p>J. R. Elias zeppelin007@earthlink.net</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	490	Elliott, Lewis	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Dear Sirs: I approve the I-70 mountain corridor, combination/preservation proposal number 6, a six-lane highway with future rail transit in median. Though the initial construction costs are higher, I believe the public acceptance of rail transportation will be overwhelming from estimates of use. The time period of 1890 to 1940 were a boom time for rail transport. The next 50 years to 1990 were one of decline in rail usage. I believe we are in a new renaissance for passenger rail in the US. I would like to submit a change in the rail corridor across the divide. I think the Eisenhower tunnels can be made to accommodate the increase in traffic, but the rail line should be tunneled under Loveland Pass and go to Dillon via Keystone resort. A single one rail tunnel would cost less and the increase in skier traffic would justify the line realignment. I foresee skier traffic on a corridor line via rail as the mode for skier traffic in the 21st century. Also add on to the west end to Dotsero to connect to existing Amtrak rail and future expansion to Aspen.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	592	Emmert, Matthew	Public	5/24/2005	<p>Persuasive Paper to CDOT Matthew Emmert Block 5/6- Rob SS/LA May 20, 2005</p> <p>My choice for the I-70 corridor would be the monorail train. My reasoning for wanting the train is because the train would cost less per person than what any other option would. This would be good for most people's income. It would not need a lot of construction. Therefore, it would be better for the environment.</p> <p>The reasoning for having the train would be that if the population grew it start to bring the taxes down, and they would be able to increase the length of the train to accommodate more people. It would cost less per person, and in my studies, it showed that it would cost 75 cents a person. If the population grows, they can just add cars and they would stay stable because magnets power it. As the people travel it will take less time because there will be less stopping along the way. This is why the monorail is better for wildlife, and people.</p> <p>Now I will talk about the ethics behind the I-70 corridor widening. The monorail would be less dangerous to animals because they can just walk underneath the tracks. It can be worked on easily with only temporary closure instead of multiple closures, plus they will have an extra train. The track would not take as long to build because it would not require any blasting. The monorail would not take as long to build.</p> <p>In this portion I will express my feelings on the subject of the widening of the highway. The highway makes me angry because of how much it would cost. The monorail makes me feel better because cost less per person and as the population increases it would cost even less. It also sounds better to me because when the demand becomes greater they can just increase the length of the train. These are my feelings on the subject.</p> <p>There are many arguments that can be brought up. Number one: "How will the monorail cost less?" My answer to this that the people riding it will be paying to ride it. Number two: "How will they be able to add on trains?" My answer to this is that each train will have its own magnets, allowing it to be self-propelled. Number three: "Why won't they have to blast away the mountains?" My answer to this is that the train will use only the space available.</p> <p>My position is that the trains are better than the highway. So when the vote comes, vote for the monorail!</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	534	Enright, Fran	Public	5/21/2005	<p>I am concerned about the Wildlife Crossings. Can a wildlife crossing at St.Mary's be designed so that carnivores can cross but goats cannot? A wolf was killed in the St.Mary's location on I-70. Should dispersing wolves be considered in this study?</p> <p>Are there highway crossings for wildlife that do not accomodate young? Can the young climb over Jersey barriers??</p> <p>With the extraordinary number of wildlife killed along Mt.Vernon canyon, are there crossings in this area??</p> <p>What is the effect of the different alternatives on the wildlife crossing at the Twin Tunnels in Clear Creek?</p> <p>ALIVE was referenced but the material was not included in the PEIS.</p> <p>What is the economic impact on Clear Creek County of the different construction schedules?</p> <p>On page F-45, CDOT and FHWA will be closing off discussions of ideas that cannot or will not be considered in the decision making process with the ALIVE group. Will the criteria that CDOT and FHWA have/use be available to the public before such meetings? Will the meeting notes be available to the public in a timely fashion?</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	39	Erwin, Chuck	Public	1/14/2005	<p>MORE LANES! No Rail, buses, or any other type of transit. These "solutions" do not work. You cannot solve congestion by expanding capacity for a non-congested mode. Transit is not congested, the highway is. Many of the transit advocates any town say they will use the new service. Even choose everyday to drive, even when there is a current route that goes right to their destination. It will be no different here. I just don't get how expanding capacity for a non-congested mode will improve traffic. It</p>	Online

					<p>would be just like Wal-Mart "solving" lines at the registers at 5pm by having more cashiers and registers open at 3am. Wal-Mart would never do this because it wouldn't change many people's shopping habits, and would result in lost business, and wasted resources. The additional hours (resources) would be better spent by adding cashiers to deal with the lines at 5pm, just like scarce resources are better spent expanding capacity for the preferred mode. Otherwise, you will only drive tourist away, harm our economy, and quality of life.</p>	
Categorized Comment	40	Erwin, Chuck	Public	1/14/2005	Focus public outreach for commits on the millions who use the highway every year, and thus are inconvenienced by daily congestion, NOT the few people who chose to live close to the highway.	Online
Categorized Comment	441	Erwin, Chuck	Public	4/15/2005	<p>Everyday, congestion causes countless commuters across the county to sit in traffic, while their cars belch out fumes. This harms air quality, wastes gas, increases our dependence on foreign oil, and reduces time spent with our families. Solving this problem is a daunting, but not impossible task if we focus on three main priorities:</p> <p>A. Expand capacity for the mode most used            B. Expand capacity for the congested mode            C. Preserve right-of-way prior to, or as development occurs for future traffic needs well beyond the twenty year period.</p> <p>NOTE: the terms highway and freeway interchangeably to mean a roadway with access on and off only at grade-separated interchanges.</p> <p>In an ideal world, we could have as much transit and highways as we want, but in reality, budget constraints creates trade-offs preventing this. Even with federal matching funds, doing one project means another goes unfunded. When faced with these and rapidly increasing congestion, transit simply costs too much per person trip, and carries too few trips to be a viable alternative. Therefore, transit funding should be at a minimum and focused on those who cannot drive. Any additional funding beyond that wastes needed dollars that are better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>Transit fails points A and B above miserably. Despite transit users paying under 30% of operating costs at the fare box, transit carries less than 2% of all trips nationwide. What would ridership be if transit cost over \$6.00 per five to ten mile trip? On the other hand, gas taxes pay the vast majority of highway construction and maintenance costs, despite diverting some gas tax revenues to transit. When confronted with the true cost of driving, most still prefer to drive. ****There is a small vocal minority pushing transit over highways, but a large non vocal majority who everyday prefer driving even when a bus or rail line goes to their destination. **** Even at rush hour, most buses have many empty seats, while highways experience severe congestion. Should we waste money expanding modal "options" few people use, while the rest sit in traffic? Or, spend funds on the mode carrying over 90% of all trips? Do we build light rail or HOV lanes hoping they will reduce pollution, or expand our highway network, reducing needless fuel consumption and pollution from idling cars? EXPANDING CAPACITY FOR NON-CONGESTED MODES ONLY WASTES VALUABLE FUNDS THAT ARE BETTER SPENT ELSEWHERE.</p> <p>With limited funding, additional capacity for the mode most used must be paramount. Spending 60% of transportation funds on a mode carrying less than 2% of trips is imbalanced. In a balanced transportation system, the budget for each mode mirrors its trip share. If transit's trip share is 2%, then it's total budget should not exceed 2% of the total transportation budget. This frees needed funds for new highways. If the all gas tax revenues from the Highway User's Trust Fund went to highways instead of portions being spent on transit, the resulting reduction in congestion from additional freeway lane miles will improve air quality far more than new rail lines. The little reduction in pollution from a few drivers using transit is far less than the increased pollution from additional cars stuck in traffic as capacity improvements are not built. Keeping cars stuck in traffic by wasting funds on modal options few use instead of highways is NOT the solution!</p> <p>Light rail is not a viable option for the vast majority of trips. Most trips do not originate and end by a rail line. Most refuse to be confined to routes, schedules and transfers, even at five minute headways. Transit will never transport us from point A to B as quick as a car in free-flowing traffic. Hoping congestion will encourage transit only reduces family time, and quality of life. You cannot solve congestion by expanding capacity for a non-congested mode. We need alternate roads NOT modes.</p> <p>Some tout light rail as clean. This is not the case. Light rail gets its operating power from coal burning power plants, which emits greenhouse gases, and produces acid rain. Due to environmental regulations, building new plants is very difficult and costly.</p> <p>HOV/HOT lanes are also not a viable option. HOV's only waste capacity improvements by limiting the number of people that can use them. Most people who carpool would without the HOV lane. Few people carpool to work because of the inconveniences associated with carpooling (different schedules, live to far apart etc.) This does not change significantly with construction of these lanes. HOV's only restrict the number of vehicles able to use the lane, thereby reducing vehicle capacity of the roadway. Additionally, they cost more to construct, and sap funds from needed capacity improvements for the congested mode. Converting HOV lanes to general purpose lanes, increases vehicle capacity at very little cost.</p> <p>Expanding highways also saves lives by reducing emergency response times and decreasing accidents. Every second emergency vehicles are stuck in traffic is a second longer someone is without needed emergency assistance. Additionally, studies show congestion increases accidents and injuries. Sudden changes in speed cause rear-end collisions and role-overs, as drivers try to avoid the car in front of them. I witnessed two role-over accidents. The first had no fatalities, but a passenger in the second wreck died. Continued over-emphasis in transit only increases congestion and highway injuries. How many people must die before we expand our highways?? Enough is enough!! Is providing modal options worth additional deaths due to increased accidents from congestion??</p> <p>Some argue, widening highways only encourages additional car use, refilling the highway. What if doctors followed this same "logic"? Could a doctor justify his actions in court by saying, "Your Honor, if I unclogged the arteries feeding the heart, it would have encouraged him to eat foods high in fat and cholesterol. This would mean additional surgery in a few years. Therefore, I refused surgery to encourage better eating habits." Did someone say "lawsuit"? This would be a blatant case of not tending to a patient's needs. This is the same attitude some apply to the transportation arteries of our region. Not expanding highways is committing a form of malpractice with this region's transportation dollars.</p> <p>Highways do not become congested due to access capacity. If they were, I-90 through Wyoming would be clogged, as-well-as I-25 through Denver at 3am. Obviously, this is not the case. In reality, freeways are congested because of an inadequate supply of roadway to deal with travel demands during times of congestion.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	204	Erwin, Chuck	Public	2/23/2005	JUST SAY NOOOO!! TO TRANSIT!! Transit does not solve congestion. Even in cities that have it, people have demonstrated their overwhelming preference to drive. Do not be deceived by the squeaky wheel that gets the grease. What is really needed is more lanes. YOU CANNOT SOLVE CONGESTION BY EXPANDING CAPACITY FOR A NONCONGESTED MODE! Maybe, reroute the highway away from Idaho Springs, and provide no access to Idaho Springs from the highway. Maybe then, as the local economy dries up, and shops close, they might appreciate there economic lifeline (the highway). Besides, why should the 40,000+ people who use the highway everyday be damned to never-ending congestion just because a few hundred people do not want it widened. The needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few.	Online
Categorized Comment	191	Espinosa, Robert	Public	2/16/2005	Do not allow toll roads to be built along the I-70 corridor.	Online
Categorized Comment	352	Espinosa, Robert	Public	2/16/2005	<p>My name is Robert Espinoza. I'm a Colorado native. I live at 5 Shore Pine, that's Littleton, Colorado 80127. That's in Ken Caryl Valley.</p> <p>I am opposed to any action happening on the I-70 corridor. If no action is taken, travel will naturally be suppressed. If you have construction along the I-70 corridor, you are going to hurt the economy in that area until the year 2025. Do you want to do that?</p> <p>And I'd like to ask the people in Eagle County, in Summit County, the people, not the developers: Do you want more people up there?</p> <p>And I don't know what CDOT is doing. The advanced guideway system, the citizens of Colorado have already told them -- told the state that they do not want that. I believe that was in 2000. The citizens said they didn't even want a study -- to finance a study to promote that system. I don't know what CDOT's thinking about.</p> <p>You know, you've heard people here tonight talk about the environment being hurt, and you know that will happen with all the mines that were up there, all the mine tailings. You cannot help but contaminate the water up there.</p> <p>The biggest tourist attractions in Colorado are the 16th Street Mall and Cherry Creek Shopping Center. Why do you need to send more tourists up the mountain?</p>	Transcripts

What I'd like to urge you to do is contact your congressman, your state senator, and tell them that -- do not allow a bureaucracy like CDOT to make a decision on this. Do not do anything there; what is happening now is working just fine.

So I'm opposing anything happening on this project.

Categorized Comment	358	Esty, Jon	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/16/2005	<p>Thank you. My name is Jon Esty. I'm president of the Colorado Rail Passenger Association, also known as ColoRail. We're an all-volunteer group in Colorado. We support passenger rail in and through the state of Colorado.</p> <p>We've been privileged to be a part of the mountain corridor area advisory committee, so we've had an opportunity to talk over the past two or three years with CDOT and the consultants about our interests in passenger rail and other modes -- alternative modes in the corridor. We appreciate that opportunity. But I did want to say that we do fully endorse the comments made by the young lady from the Sierra Club earlier. We completely agree with that.</p> <p>Let me just say something else which I really think we corridor folks need to be taking a look at. One of the things we're having difficulty understanding is why the consultants aren't taking a look at existing systems that could actually help alleviate some of the traffic on the corridor. And since the passage of FasTracks, I think it's important to note that it's possible that what could be used as the ski train along the -- from Denver Union Station to Winter Park, currently, that's sold out on the weekends, that's 750 people that ride that train. That's the equivalent of 350 cars taken off the highway at a time when the roadways are congested.</p> <p>RTD will be having some double-deck commuter railcars with FasTracks that aren't going to be doing anything on the weekend. And possibly, those could be pressed into service to actually double the capacity of the ski train taking more cars off the road between C-470 and Empire at a time when the congestion is more serious. So we would just ask CDOT and the consultants to take another look, considering that there will be railcars -- railcars available to be able to provide that service on the corridor.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	223	Esty, Jon	Public	2/27/2005	<p>A TDM Suggestion: I would like the study consultants to look at the economics of improving the capacity of the Ski Train which presently sells out on winter (and many summer) weekends and moves approximately 750 people to Winter Park and back to Denver at times that the I-70 Corridor is most congested.</p> <p>With the passage of FasTracks, improving the capacity of the Ski Train becomes an even more realistic option. As FasTracks commuter rail corridors are developed, RTD will be acquiring a fleet of double deck commuter rail cars. These cars will generally be idle at weekend times and could be used to double the present capacity of the train and replace the aging TEMPO cars which are rapidly approaching the end of their service life. The Ski Train, operated by the Anshutz Company, does not make a profit so I am sure they would be hard pressed to find and pay for new rail cars when the TEMPO cars are retired.</p> <p>I would also suggest that a boarding area and parking lot be constructed on RTD owned land at 80th &amp; Urban in Arvada next to the UPRR Moffat Line so that residents of western Metro Denver could board the train without having to travel to Denver Union Station. This additional station would increase patronage on the train made possible by the use of the double deck commuter rail equipment.</p> <p>Thank you for giving consideration to this idea.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	263	Evans, David	Public	2/2/2005	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. My name is David Evans. I'm the director of the bicycling community.</p> <p>We have concerns about this corridor. I'm the chairman for the Bicycle Colorado -- executive vice for Bicycle Colorado. We are concerned that this corridor is not very friendly towards bicyclists. We currently have carried out a survey of the corridor and found out that there were, in fact, stretches where bicyclists are required to enter the freeway between Evergreen Parkway to Genesee and then from Bakerville up to the Tunnel entrance to the Loveland Pass.</p> <p>So we would think that if CDOT is serious about this work going on, we need to really start doing something and not just talk about it. We would like to see a project completed throughout this area as part of this project.</p> <p>We know that Clear Creek County is working hard right now to introduce trails through their county. They still have some work to do and so does Jefferson County.</p> <p>Tied in with the cycling experience is the fact that cycling alongside a six- or an eight-lane highway is not exactly enjoyable. So once again, we see that maybe moving to multimodal and incorporating trains and light-rail, as comfortable as monorail is, the right thing.</p> <p>I have an experience that was brought to bear. I was in Europe traveling from Geneva to Paris on a high-speed monorail, or 80 mile-an-hour train. We stopped at a little station called Belgrade and went right up in the ski area. And whole lots of people got off from skiing at 6:30 at night and rode back to Paris 350, 400 miles away, and had been done with their skiing for the day. They rode 400 miles in the morning for two hours, and two hours back at night. You wouldn't do that on I-70, I think either. That's equivalent to, I don't know, driving a vehicle up to go skiing. I don't think you'd do that in a day.</p> <p>So we need to get off this more highways, more and wider highways. We can see it decimates the communities in Clear Creek County, as you must have heard. So we're here to support a multimodal solution to this, this would be putting a decent rail service in, have it connect into FasTracks. Maybe at some point you can build a rail all the way from DIA to Breckenridge.</p> <p>One of the things about the corridor, from my simple analysis is, a lot of the idea is to principal destinations. Yes, the train may not be very good if you're wanting to walk around in the wilds and there's no bus service to that place. But the train service in and along the corridor [INAUDIBLE] communities of aspen and places like that, it would certainly be used. I'm part of the generation, I guess, that really didn't -- I look at these 2025 year plans and I think do I really want to drive I-70 when I'm 77 years old, and I think no.</p> <p>So I definitely support some alternatives to more and wider highways. And we need to look at completing the bicycle alternative together.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	575	Evans, David	Public	5/24/2005	<p>REVISED VERSION OF TRANSCRIPT TAKEN AT PUBLIC HEARING - Please disregard previous version.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to address the I-70 Mountain corridor issue.</p> <p>I am chair of Bike Jeffco, the advocacy group for Jefferson County road cyclists. We are affiliated to Bicycle Colorado.</p> <p>The I-70 corridor is very popular with bicyclists, both with single day users from the Front Range cities and out of state long distance tourists. According to a 2000 CDOT study, tourists from out of state who engage in bicycling during a vacation at a Colorado resort spent between \$141 and \$193 million in the State. Many visitors noted that they were attracted primarily by the availability of good bicycling.</p> <p>Our group is very concerned that the favored alternatives are not very friendly towards bicyclists. The highway widening alternatives will bring increased noise and pollution to the corridor as well as radically change communities along its path, especially in Clear Creek County.</p> <p>An ongoing Bike Jeffco study of the I-70 corridor bicycling facilities shows that there are two sections of the corridor where cyclists must ride on the freeway shoulder alongside high speed traffic:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Genesee (256) to Evergreen Parkway (253)</li> <li>2) Bakerville (221) to Loveland Pass (216)</li> </ol> <p>Whatever alternative is finally chosen, this should include providing safe alternatives for bicyclists over these dangerous sections.</p> <p>A multi-modal solution, incorporating rail, provides a much better solution with much less impact on the corridor.</p> <p>If we are looking at a solution that makes sense in the year 2025, we need to be looking beyond the automobile.</p> <p>One has only to look to Europe to see how a true multi-modal transportation system is taking shape.</p>	Online

Categorized Comment	747	Evans, Kenneth	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? 6-lane highway + space for future mass transit (cost to be determined)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address. Something needs to be done to relieve the highway congestion. Kenneth Evans, Evansreeds@aol.com</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	558	Ewing, Edwin	Public	5/23/2005	<p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the I-70 corridor. I am specifically concerned about the Herman Gulch area (ext. 216). I would like to see a noise study completed and some type of sound mitigation installed. My family owns a cabin in Herman Gulch and over the years the noise from I-70 has significantly degraded the natural setting. In addition to several cabins, Herman Gulch is an increasingly popular hiking and cross-country skiing destination (the trailhead parking lot is completely full most weekends). It is my hope that the popularity of the area constitutes enough 'receptors' to justify a noise study. Additionally, I strongly encourage the development of a FGT system, rather than focus solely on expanding the existing roadway.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	579	Ewing, George	Public	5/24/2005	<p>Dear Highway Folks, thank you for the work that you do to keep us moving. Regarding the Herman Gulch area, I am a cabin owner and would love to see all the noise walls and construction concessions that a densely populated area would lobby for but I understand we're just a group of cabins by the highway. I would like our area to be evaluated for noise pollution not just for this little group of historic cabins, but for the wildlife and for the users of the Herman Gulch trail, the Watrous Gulch trail, the nearby Continental Divide Trail, and the trailhead for Grey's and Torrey's peaks. Since my family first owned a Herman Gulch cabin in 1981, we've felt these areas get more and more popular all through the year and the highway get noisier and noisier. Should the area receive a designation of Activity Level A and the resultant noise protections (as deemed necessary by studying the impact) every letter you've received asking for noise protection for this area would be backed up by many hundreds of thankful but silent users. Of course we'd love for the construction and expansion to occur away from our little cabins and on the South side of the freeway, I already understand that may not happen. Thankyou for your time in reading these comments and for your commitment to forward thinking planning and please go ahead and berm us away! Yours, George Ewing</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	603	Ewing, Wyle	Public	5/24/2005	<p>I apologize for a late comment, and for not being familiar with the PEIS in detail. I hope there will be an opportunity to offer inputs in a detailed review later.</p> <p>I was a USFS lease holder in the Herman Gulch Summer Home group (Lot E) for a number of years until moving permanently to Chaffee County, and am somewhat familiar with the USFS Master Plan as it related to the upper Clear Creek Basin area. The Herman Gulch experience as a leaseholder was invaluable in developing an awareness of natural values and beauty for me and my family.</p> <p>The preservation of visual and environmental values in the Clear Creek basin area was and I offer still is critical. The Clear Creek/Straight Creek/Eisenhower Tunnel route gives those transiting the area a rare look at mountain scenery not equaled anywhere on the Interstate system. Part of the impact other than visual is the quiet (as far as possible) associated with remoteness and the mountains.</p> <p>I offer that the visual and environmental effects (including limiting the impact of noise) of any development should be minimal, not only for their impact on the Herman Gulch area, but in the overall concept of continuing to try to give a "mountain" experience to users of the corridor. I sincerely hope that cost will not be the ultimate driving factor, but that the value of the brief exposure to the area many people experience be the major factor. Please make it so.</p> <p>Most sincerely, Wyle Ewing, 80 Tammie Drive, Buena Vista, CO 81211 7193959033</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	379	Fabyanic, Jerry	Public	2/23/2005	<p>Thank you. Hi. My name is Jerry Fabyanic, and I am a longtime resident of Georgetown, Colorado, and also a longtime teacher at Summit High School. And I'm back at the high school again. So I thought I'd come over and share a few thoughts with you.</p> <p>Because of being a resident in Georgetown and also leaching here for many years, I really consider myself a resident of both communities. I've also been submitting articles to the local papers and that, but I'm here tonight as a private citizen, not as a columnist in any way. A couple weeks ago I did write an article for the Summit Daily News, and in it I asked people to consider that in the sense you can't do just one thing, that everything has consequences of that. And for the people in Clear Creek, they are major.</p> <p>In the construction time, the disruption and so forth that's going to happen in Clear Creek is just going to be devastating. But it's not only going to impact the Clear Creek people; it's going to impact the Summit people as well. You're going to have an increase of 50 percent -- if we widen that highway, 50 percent, add two more lanes to it, you're going to increase the number of vehicles -- I'm not talking people; I'm talking number of vehicles that are coming to Summit County. Logically, they've got to go somewhere. Logically, that means increasing the traffic up to Breckenridge by 50 percent.</p> <p>Colorado 9 is a chokepoint. I drive it just about every day to get to the high school. And now you're going to add 50 percent more vehicles on there? What are you going to do about that? Are you going to widen that road a little bit more? Are you going to build an alternative road? What's going to happen there?</p> <p>Now, Colorado 9 is really just one area of impact for Summit County. You can kind of figure out on your own what all the others will be as well. But in that time there's another alternative, its called the AGS, the advanced guideway system. It is very affordable. It is not nearly the cost that is being projected here by the CDOT people. I'm very confident of that. It will move people in a very safe manner. It will be constructed in a timely manner. It can be done in ten years, within this decade.</p> <p>Okay. In the construction process, it would not nearly have the impact on the people and the canyon in Clear Creek. It doesn't have to necessarily follow the footprint of the road. You're not going to have the tearing up you're going to have with the widening of the highway in any way. With all the particulates, that's going to cause health issues for the people in Clear Creek County. That's 15 years for the highway to be created -- to be built. Why the 15 years of construction, the 15 years of inconvenience for everybody here, and 15 years of health issues ongoing for the -- particularly the people -- your neighbors in Clear Creek?</p> <p>As I say, I consider myself a resident of both communities. Tonight you're going to have the opportunity to hear from many of my friends and fellow neighbors in Clear Creek County who talk more eloquently, more specifically about the dangers that's going to happen here to the people, your neighbors, your fellow Coloradans in Clear Creek.</p> <p>Sometimes you just use a pass-through, but sometimes you also have the need for services in there. And I'm sure that many of you realize how neighborly the people can be over there. So I'm asking you to listen carefully to what my friends are saying here in Clear Creek County, how it's going to impact, maybe even destroy the environment there, the communities historically, and so on there.</p> <p>What we're looking for here is a vision. And a vision doesn't mean looking back 20 years ago for a model that will be outmoded by the time it's completed. A vision means looking into the future to create something that our children and those who come after us in Colorado could live with that is ongoing and is good for the entire community.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	543	Fabyanic, Jerry	Public	5/23/2005	<p>Any course of action must take into account impacts it will have on the Clear Creek Valley, its people, and its businesses. First and foremost are health issues, both personal and environmental--water and air quality both during and after the construction period. Second includes issues such as wildlife impact, noise pollution, et al.</p>	Online

Categorized Comment	226	Feistmann, Peter	Public	1/26/2005	<p>I'm Peter Feistmann. I live in Vail and have done so for many years.</p> <p>This is really my first exposure to this project in any detail. And the first fault that occurs to me is that I hope you give us another opportunity to comment after you have narrowed down the alternatives and provided more detail.</p> <p>Superficially -- and certainly, my response to all this is subject to change as I learn more -- the bus in guideway approach does sound like the most sensible, but to make a final determination as to what at least I think is the best alternative, I would need more information about such things as what is being done to gain confidence that people will actually use these buses. That's obviously been a problem time and again in various places. It involves access to the buses in Denver and other locations, and it involves what's going to happen to the people when they get off the buses in the various locations.</p> <p>A couple of other thoughts. I wonder why we need the two-way bus guideway? This is -- it appears to me, from looking at the information provided, a peak-period issue, to a large degree, although I do understand that that may become less and less of an issue as time goes by. I wonder if we can get by with one direction, and therefore, one bus guideway on -- that is going west in the mornings on the peak period and east in the afternoons.</p> <p>The other question I want to ask you to consider carefully is the implications of tolls. And I understand from conversations with one of the professionals here that tolls are illegal in Colorado for the entire highway, but it might be worth spending some serious time on how you could use a partial tolling system. And perhaps that could be used to offset some of the costs of the bus or any other public transit system that you decide to go forward with.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	87	Feistmann, Peter	Public	1/27/2005	<p>I attended the meeting in Avon on 1-27-05, and was the first person to comment. Some of the comments made after mine caused me to send these additional remarks.</p> <p>There is broad, and understandable consensus against both significant widening of the highway footprint, and the no action alternative. That means we are left with some form of mass transit as a part of the project. However, there is not enough information available to allow either members of the public or the decision makers to intelligently chose the best remaining alternative. It seems to me that at least the following issues need further research, and this is certainly not a complete list.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Technological feasibility of the bus guideway and the AGS.</li> <li>2) Other sources of funding, such as tolls.</li> <li>3) Likely utilization levels of buses or AGS vehicles, based on significant research.</li> <li>4) Terminal transportation to and from bus or AGS terminals.</li> <li>5) Given the time frame, alternative fuels for the buses, such as natural gas, and even hydrogen.</li> <li>6) The economic impact of the varying construction timetables.</li> </ol> <p>My final suggestion, which is the most urgent, is for a second round of presentations and public input after these issues, and others that may develop, are thoroughly research.</p> <p>There simply isn't enough information available now for either the public or the decision makers to reach responsible conclusions.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	437	Fenske, Kim	Public	4/11/2005	<p>CDOT:</p> <p>As a Town of Breckenridge bus driver, I have been in the gridlock created along State Highway 9 by already-established excessive access by vehicle traffic on the I-70 corridor.</p> <p>The only way to avert further gridlock is to construct a mass-transit supplement to the I-70 corridor that will deliver destination and commuter resort passengers directly to the inter-modal center at Breckenridge Station and other resort transit centers. Therefore, I endorse an Advanced Guideway Rapid Transit System, regardless of cost, to provide maximum economic development as well as optimal environmental protection along the I-70 corridor and impacted adjacent communities. Expansion of the I-70 to six-lane traffic is erroneous, destructive, and short-sighted planning.</p> <p>Mr. Kim Fenske, JD, MST PO Box 3431 Copper Mountain, CO 80443</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	748	Fenske, Kim	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion). Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Only mass transit with stations at central hubs of resort communities. Any other result will clog intra-city traffic lanes. Six lanes are unnecessary, with high social and environmental costs. Monorail to transit centers at Keystone, Breckenridge, and Copper Mountain is the optimal solution. Mr. Kim Fenske 370 Village Square East PO Box 3431 Copper Mountain, CO 80443 coppersnowboarder@yahoo .com</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	479	Ferraro, Craig	Public	5/9/2005	<p>I would prefer that we do not widen the highway and continue to focus on other alternatives, including but not limited to, some sort of high speed monorail. I also believe that restricting tractor/trailers at certain times of certain days and the continued enforcement of chain laws should be explored. I realize that studies project gridlock for the corridor but believe that adding additional lanes will not be an effective long term solution, that the denagration for the small towns along I-70 will be significant and not worthwhile and that only by utilizing mass transit can we help the corridor on a long term basis.</p> <p>The costs of this appear to be significant, but I believe that the overall cost to society are much less with this type of solution.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	234	Ferraro, Kristi	Public	1/26/2005	<p>My name is Kristi Ferraro, and I'm an Avon town council member. And I haven't read the PEIS yet, but I just wanted to make a few observations.</p> <p>This valley is narrow. It's a valley where a highway runs through it. And we talk a lot up here about, you know, the train is the goose that laid the golden egg, which up here is tourism.</p> <p>You know, you've done an analysis about how traffic will suppress tourism. Has there been any analysis about how a wider highway and a more dominant highway, you know, suppresses tourism and makes us a much less wonderful place for people to visit?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts

Categorized Comment	228	Fickling, Nicholas	Public	1/26/2005	<p>My name's Nicholas Fickling, and I am a resident of Eagle County. I've been here for six years. And I was brought up in Europe, so I have a slightly different perspective on things.</p> <p>I read the document with interest. It was a very interesting presentation earlier. You had a very clear and succinct need statement, which if I may be so bold, was rather engineer-focused. Later on you had a list of purposes which seems to be very community-focused.</p> <p>What was lacking or what is lacking, or appears to be lacking in this whole process is avision statement. And there are very few major capital development -- public capital developments, whatever, that take place in the world which don't have a vision statement.</p> <p>And the sort of thing I'm thinking for this is how will the -- Colorado and the central mountains are going to be when everything is finished and the last brick is being put in place and so forth. What is the vision for this project?</p> <p>Is it going to be more Tarmacadam up through the mountains, with perhaps the same problem coming up again in many years to come, or is it going to be for increased tourism that was mentioned as the major industry in this state?</p> <p>Is it going to be for vibrant mountain communities that we've heard from the previous speaker that a lot of parts of the vibrant communities will not exist, or will not exist in the same way if a lot of this project takes place?</p> <p>Is it going to be for improved quality of life for Coloradans and their guests? I don't know because I can't see it from this presentation or the document associated.</p> <p>In Europe, rather bravely and against a large proportion of the sensible financial people in London, a tunnel was built between France and Britain. And there were lots of headlines in the papers about bad things about that project and so forth, but the project was pushed through politically because the people had a vision of what was going to be the result of this project.</p> <p>It was going to be connecting the capitals of Europe. It was going to be for making Europe a better place. And it was going to be for making a Europe that people would be happy and proud to live in. It was a vision long-term.</p> <p>People said that that project -- they put a cap -- financial cap on it, said that project is going to cost too much money, and that was right. But then they amortized, they changed it.</p> <p>And the 4 billion threshold you've put on this project, artificially, is an artificial ceiling. There are many clever people with money -- I am not one of them -- but I know that it's possible for the job to amortize the cost of a project over, say, a hundred years, which sounds ridiculous, but it may make another alternative that will produce the vision that this document does not have.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	431	Fiorini, Renee	Public	4/6/2005	<p>The State of Colorado and it's citizens need to seriously contemplate putting in a monarail for a long term solution.</p> <p>Widening I-70 does nothing for us in the years to come.</p> <p>There simply is not enough space to widen the highway to accomodate future traffic. Past studies have proven this over and over again.</p> <p>I have given up every reason that I live in Colorado and love about Colorado because I don't have the time to sit in the traffic in the mountains!</p> <p>Colorado has become a paycheck and that is it to me! If it continues - I hope to not retire here!!!!</p> <p>Renee Fiorini (a family member of a Colorado Pioneer)</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	661	Colorado Counties Inc.	Associations & Special Interest Groups	4/29/2005	<p>Colorado Counties, Inc. 800 Grant Street, Suite 500 Denver, Colorado 80203 www.ccionline.org</p> <p>April 29, 2005</p> <p>Mr. Tom Norton, Executive Director Colorado Department of Transportation 4201 E. Arkansas Ave. Room 262 Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Dear Mr. Norton:</p> <p>The CCI Tourism and Resorts Steering Committee is concerned about the Preferred Group of alternatives in the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS. Specifically, we are concerned about the potential economic impact of an extended construction period on the only major access route from the Front Range Metro area to the mountains. The mountain resort and gaming communities along the I-70 Corridor contribute significantly to Colorado's tourism economy and could be seriously affected by an extended I-70 construction period.</p> <p>The draft PEIS document does not set forth a proposed construction schedule (other than the duration of 15 years from 2010 to 2025), explain how the construction process for the preferred alternatives will be managed, or how mobility in the Corridor will be maintained during the construction period. For example, the Draft PEIS does not indicate whether construction work will occur year round or just from May through October, which is comparable to the project schedule for the US 40 work on Berthoud Pass (in order to avoid winter recreation impacts to Grand, Routt, and Jackson County resort communities). More consideration of the scheduling and management of the project to minimize travel impacts is needed to ensure that negative impacts on the state economy can be avoided.</p> <p>The Preferred grouping in the Draft PEIS selects all the six lane highway alternatives and the bus in guideway transit alternative. Each of these alternatives is identified as having the "Greatest" construction impact of all alternatives due to the number of miles of highway requiring reconstruction. This committee strongly encourages further consideration of alternatives, including alternate routes and mass transit options, that would minimize construction impacts on this vital interstate highway corridor. We would recommend an option be made available to provide Colorado's residents and visitors with a viable alternative to extensive construction delays before any main line I-70 highway construction is initiated. An approach that would leave the current four lane I-70 highway basically intact while a construction alternate is created would be desirable and much more tourism friendly than simply reconstructing the highway.</p> <p>Our visitors and residents depend on reliable transportation from the Denver/Colorado Springs Metro area and airports to the mountains. Unavoidable construction closures, detours, congestion and delays may persuade our visitors to visit elsewhere on future trips. Tourism is the state's number two industry and with Colorado's economy struggling to make a comeback from the difficult late 1990 and early 2000 years, we cannot afford to chase our visitors away during an extended construction period. We urge CDOT and the FHWA to carefully consider the selection of a Preferred Alternative, including mass transit options, and develop a plan that provides adequate capacity to the mountains during any mainline I-70 reconstruction. Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Elaine Fischer, Chair Colorado Counties Inc., Tourism &amp; Resorts Steering Committee</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	568	Flaherty, Gordon	Public	5/23/2005	<p>An identified funding source must be found.</p> <p>I believe a tunnel extending from just above East Vail through the south side of the valley would be an answer to I-70 thru Vail. It would travel under Vail Mountain and exit somewhere west of West Vail near Dowd Junction.</p> <p>The cost of the tunnel could be offset by selling the land I-70 currently occupies in the Vail Valley. My understanding that equates to approximately 550 acres of land. That would generate \$2,200,000,000 if sold at \$4,000,000 per acre. 20 miles of tunnel at \$100,000,000 per mile would equal \$2,000,000,000. That would leave \$200,000,000 for the rest of the project.</p> <p>I don't know how close my estimates are but it give some idea of the feasibility of this tunnel.</p> <p>The dirt could be used at the prososed Wolcott reseviior for the dam construction.</p> <p>There would be no delays during construction.</p> <p>It would answer Vail's I-70 noise concerns.</p> <p>I would like this idea included in the PEIS.</p> <p>THANK YOU.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	333	Flanagan, Cheryl	Public	3/14/2005	<p>If CDOT will build a passenger railway up to Summit County it will be viewed around the nation and world as one of the greatest steps forward in Colorado tourism since the feat of building the Eisenhower Tunnel.</p> <p>More cars will just fill more lanes, more tunnels. And there will be more road rage, more accidents. But a train transportation system will be used by generations of travelers in a fun and safe manner. It is a forward-looking approach in a day of crowded highways and high gas prices. We need to look to this method of transportation more and more, and CDOT could lead the way. I hope CDOT will consider an old approach which has become modern and revolutionary in the changing times. Thank you.</p>	Online



Categorized Comment	ID	Author	Category	Date	Text	Type
Categorized Comment	221	Follett, Bob	Public	2/25/2005	<p>I have studied the Draft PEIS for the I-70 Mountain Corridor and have the following comments.</p> <p>1. There is insufficient money to do a satisfactory project, regardless of which construction alternative is selected. The lack of funds will mean that I-70 will be a mess for far too long a time. (The people of Clear Creek County don't deserve the problems that lengthy work on I-70 will cause for them.) By the time any of the alternatives is completed, the work will be obsolete, the technology will have changed, the population size and location will be different than currently anticipated. Unless sufficient funding can be obtained to do the work very quickly, the best alternative is to do nothing -- or perhaps to make some minor upgrades and adjustments to deal with the most egregious bottlenecks.</p> <p>2. Various mass transit alternatives are appealing to many, but without the planning, funding, and implementation of feeder mass transit connecting to the I-70 corridor stations, the mass transit alternatives are useless. What do people do when they get off the I-70 mass transit vehicle? Summit County has a great many potential destinations and has no funds and no plans to take people from the I-70 corridor stations to these multiple destinations.</p> <p>3. Adding more car lanes is preferred by many, especially resort operators. All of the interstate widenings I have experienced have seen congestion just as bad within a year or two of the completion of the widening. Traffic expands to fill the available space. How much money will resort operators put up to help achieve the widening they prefer?</p> <p>4. There ought to be a number of possible methods to make the current I-70 accommodate more traffic in peak periods. There might be controls on truck traffic at certain times. The resorts have halfheartedly tried bus service from the Denver metro area to bring skiers up and back on weekends. A better planned and implemented bus service, picking up people at various Denver metro sites and taking them to a ski/resort area, might have a significant positive impact on weekend traffic flows. For those people who just want to come up to the mountains to ski on Saturday or Sunday, this could be a viable alternative to driving -- if the economics were reasonable. Such a bus service is not likely to be a profitable venture by itself. It would have to be subsidized. But the subsidies would be far, far cheaper than any of the proposed construction alternatives.</p> <p>5. After much study, much thought, and much discussion, I strongly favor the "no action" alternative.</p> <p>Perhaps, in future years, when sufficient funding is available and new technologies can be put to use, it will be time to undertake a major improvement of the I-70 corridor. Now is not the time.</p> <p>I go from Summit County to Denver and back about once a week. Occasionally, the trip becomes slow and difficult. Accidents and weather conditions are more of a problem than excessive traffic.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Bob Follett</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	407	Forester-Rapp, Kristin	Public	2/26/2005	<p>Hello. My name is Kristin Forester-Rapp. I live in Arvada where I have a small horse property. I would qualify myself as a concerned citizen with a strong interest in the future of the open spaces and the lands of Colorado. When I hear corporate representatives like I did on Wednesday night in Silverthorne say to put six lanes into the mountains so that 40,000 more cars can come to our ski resorts, I become worried for the future of Colorado.</p> <p>My worries concern the three W's tonight. It's water, working ranches, and wildlife. More cars mean more pollution for our waters. Government has a clear responsibility to protect our water quality. It bothers me greatly when our government agency, CDOT, is advocating more pollution when less polluting alternatives are available.</p> <p>The working ranches in western Colorado are already under stress. Adding 40,000 more cars to the mix will not help them.</p> <p>Finally, wildlife, the notion that wildlife will cross under six lanes of highway is nonsense, plus 40,000 more vehicles will only harness and destroy wildlife habitat. I do not think that pandering to the highway lobby or large corporations while perpetuating the car culture of America is what we should do. This is not -- does not sound like the best solution for the future of Colorado.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	393	Forester-Rapp, Kristin	Public	2/23/2005	<p>My name is Kristin Forrester Rapp, and I'm a resident of Arvada, Colorado. I used to live in Idaho Springs, so I have deep ties to the mountains and the history and the values of the place that's going to be most directly affected by this PEIS.</p> <p>I'm also -- for anyone in the background, I'm a current student of the Denver Seminary working on my -- trying to get my thesis done. I'm doing a comparative analysis of Greek, Hebrew, Arabic. So I'm really deeply involved in the taxonomy of words, phrases, languages, and ideas to do the comparative analysis.</p> <p>I'm also trained at the Denver Seminary not to make any predeterminations or presuppositions when I approach scripture. I used that training to study the PEIS, and I found myself -- of course, the PEIS is not even close to scripture, in my mind, but it does lend itself to the same type of analysis. And I find that the PEIS appears to be a prescription thinly disguised to justify that a decision has already been made. And such a document is self-indicting.</p> <p>To someone who is not a casual reader, the authors of the PEIS have carelessly, and oftentimes not so subtly, left their fingerprints, footprints, and sometimes more direct evidence of puppet masters that have shaped their biased and orchestrated predeterminations. Although they were probably told to maintain the facade of legal sufficiency, there is evidence in nearly every section of calculated predetermination.</p> <p>PEIS bias can be detected in the particular rhetoric, the nuances in the adjectives, and the adverbs, the forcefulness of or the weaknesses of the verbs, and in the location and frequency of errors and omissions in data, in analysis of certain alternatives. The overreaching implication and the hidden assumption without foundation or with arbitrary and capricious edict also show a predetermination.</p> <p>There are arguments and stipulations that are not supported by facts, thus the document challenges or indicts the legal sufficiency of this process. I have some examples: Why does the PEIS use the powerful adjectives, adverbs, and verbs when discussing highway widening and weak ones when discussing the alternatives, advance guideway system? Why does the PEIS fail to discuss the AGS in real terms as a deployable Colorado 200 system? The nuance that they put forth in the PEIS is that the AGS is some sort of fictional future system, when, in fact, the public should know that it is a present reality that can be implemented in the next ten years. I suggest the public go beyond just what is being put forth by CDOT on the Internet, there are other locations to get more in-depth information. And I think the public needs to be aware of that.</p> <p>Why does the PEIS fail to include any options for an early deployment of offline transit in conjunction with climbing lanes, yet asserts that all options and combinations have been considered?</p> <p>Why does the PEIS assert conclusions about the SWEEP process when there is no evidence that any were made or that the group ever achieved consensus before being adjourned?</p> <p>So I ask the Summit County residents that have been pushing for the highway widening, then going to keep leaving the option for a transit -- I suggest you guys read the PEIS with more details, with more discernment. Also, look at the language being put forth by the PEIS and realize that they have already -- it appears to a casual reader that they have already set a predetermined idea, and all these wonderful little graphs just point to a predetermined solution. And I think the Summit County residents need to understand that there is more involved and more omitted than they see tonight.</p> <p>Fortunately, the public comment period has been extended 75 days longer than originally intended so that each section of the PEIS can be analyzed as described above and reported on by subject matter experts. It is believed that the results will be more enlightening.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	353	Forester-Rapp, Kristin	Public	2/16/2005	<p>My name is Kristin Rapp, and I used to be a resident of Idaho Springs, on the west side right along the Colorado Boulevard. I reside now in Arvada. I know how busy the Colorado Boulevard and I-70 gets on the weekends, and that's gotten much more busier in the year since I've moved.</p> <p>So I went to the first PEIS meeting on Floyd Hill, and I walked away with a number of concerns. One of them is the concern of CDOT that their mentality is stuck in the 1950s that if you build more highways, more roads, your cars will go faster. Well, that has been proven wrong. If you look at any major city across the United States, more cars means more cars, more congestion, and we're right back where we began in 2025.</p> <p>What also bothers me is the mentality of CDOT that the public wants this, that they want widening of the road. It seems like we're going to a public hearing, but it's already well past. Also, the price tag of 4 billion that the -- Colorado will only accept that without -- I think that many of us want a long-term vision that would mean we can expect a larger price tag if it means a better future for our kids and grandkids.</p> <p>I have a number of questions for CDOT. Why does CDOT believe it prudent to add more lanes to the</p>	Transcripts

					<p>negative back drops? For every -- they have to repave their highways every seven years? Where are those costs in all their nice diagrams of the maintenance of highway widening?</p> <p>Why does CDOT think it's prudent to add more noise, air, and water pollution along I-70? Why does CDOT believe that it's prudent to impact adversely the historical and cultural sites in and along Clear Creek? Why does CDOT believe it's prudent to add a 15-year burden to the mountain communities? Why does CDOT believe it's prudent to cause a 15-year cone backup along this city and right along the people that live there, and especially when they have other alternatives? This mentality that people may not use the monorail because they have their cars, well, I've lived outside of Washington, D.C., when they built the Metro, and I know for a fact that if you build a nice system, people will use it. It's -- it won't go empty.</p> <p>And also -- I've got 30 seconds. The mentality that the monorail hasn't been done before, well, I think engineering has made technological advances. If we can put a space shuttle up in the atmosphere, I think we can find a way to get a monorail up Floyd Hill and up Genesee. This is [INAUDIBLE DUE TO APPLAUSE] like other options. I hope CDOT looks at that before they go to the highway widening.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
Categorized Comment	810	Forester-Rapp, Kristin	Public	2/23/2005	<p>The Questions of Self Indictment V</p> <p>23 Feb 2003. My name is Kristin Forrester Rapp. I am a resident of Arvada, Colorado with deep ties to the mountains, the history and values of place concerned in this draft PEIS. I am also a student of theology using the taxonomy of words, phrases, language and ideas for comparative analyses in scripture. This PEIS lends itself to the same types of analyses. The PEIS is not scripture but appears to be a prescription thinly disguised to justify a decision previously made. As such the document is self indicting.</p> <p>To someone who is not a casual reader, the authors of the PEIS have carelessly and often times not so subtly left fingerprints, footprints and sometimes more direct evidence of the puppet masters that shaped their biased and orchestrated predeterminations. Although they were probably told to maintain a façade of legal sufficiency, there is an appearance in nearly every section of calculated predetermination.</p> <p>PEIS bias can be detected in the particular rhetoric, the nuances in the adjectives and adverbs, and the forcefulness or weakness of the verbs and in the location and frequency of errors and omissions in data and analyses for certain alternatives. The overreaching implication and hidden assumption without foundation or with arbitrary and capricious edict also show a predetermination. There are arguments and stipulations that are not supported by fact. Thus the document itself indicts the legal sufficiency of the process and may in fact point to malfeasance and even conspiracy to commit public fraud.</p> <p>My three minute sound bite does not leave much time, but here are some examples:  o Why does the PEIS use the power adjectives, adverbs and verbs when discussing highway widening, and weak ones when discussing AGS?  o Why does the PEIS fail to discuss AGS in its real terms as a deployable Colorado 200 system? The nuance is that the alternative is a fictional future system?  o Why does the PEIS fail to include any options for an early deployment of off line transit in conjunction with climbing lanes yet asserts that all options and combinations have been considered?  o Why does the PEIS assert conclusions about the SWEEP process when there is no evidence that any were made or that the group ever achieved consensus before being adjourned?</p> <p>Fortunately the public comment period is now 75 days longer than originally intended so that each section of this PEIS can be analyzed as described above and reported on by subject matter experts. It is believed that the results will be most enlightening.</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
Categorized Comment	811	Forester-Rapp, Kristin	Public	2/26/2005	<p>February 26, 2005</p> <p>Three w's</p> <p>I am Kristin Forrester Rapp of Arvada, Colorado where I have a small horse property. I would qualify myself as a concerned citizen with strong interest in the future of the open spaces and lands of Colorado.</p> <p>When I hear corporate representatives say 'put six lanes into the mountains so that 40,000 more cars can come to our ski resorts' I become worried for the future of Colorado.</p> <p>My worries center around three W's: water, working ranches and wildlife.</p> <p>More cars mean more pollution to our waters. Government has a clear responsibility to protect water quality. It bothers me greatly when our government agency, CDOT, is advocating more pollution when less polluting alternatives are available.</p> <p>The working ranches in Western Colorado are already under stress. Adding 40,000 more cars to the mix will not help them.</p> <p>Finally, wildlife. Then notion that wildlife will cross under a six lane highway is nonsense. Plus 40,000 more vehicles harass and destroy space.</p> <p>I do not think that pandering to the highway lobby and large corporations, while perpetuating the 'car culture' of America is what we should do. This does not sound like the best solution for the future of Colorado.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
Categorized Comment	133	Fowler, Hugh	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Hi, I'm Hugh Fowler. I'm from Denver. I served on the CIFGA Board for however long we were there. And I greet all my friends from CDOT who sat in on our meetings and what we had to do. This is a great meeting. And I want to congratulate you on the visuals. I've been in this business, and I know how much time and effort and money goes into that.</p> <p>I think, myself, after spending a lot of time on transportation and transit issues in this state -- I was a state senator in Arapahoe County for many years. The highwaymen killed my light-rail project in Denver in 1969 and again in 1986. The highwaymen are still at it. They were considered bad people 200 years ago when they were interfering with transportation on the roads of Europe, and they're still bad people. They don't understand the difference between a highway and transportation.</p> <p>Now, you guys are really -- and I know you're working hard at what you're doing. I think the monorail must be built. One of the things that you -- that would be helpful -- I know you folks can't change this, but everybody else in this room, instead of saying "AGS," please start saying "monorail." That's what they say, and you need to speak in terms that they understand. You can also, if you like, start talking about highwaymen; it's what they are.</p> <p>Now, you're going to be able to choose this politically, and that's probably the only way you're going to be able to do it. You're going to have to choose a governor who is not a highwayman. And I don't know who that is. I don't see anybody on the horizon. The highwaymen comes riding, riding, riding, but there's hope.</p> <p>Why is there hope? Because all you people in this room, you're going to do a great job. Jo Ann, Ed, all you guys, keep it up.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	156	Fralick, Peter	Public	2/2/2005	<p>February 2, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy  Colorado Department of Transportation  Region 1  18500 East Colfax Avenue  Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>P.O. Box 1164  Avon, CO 81620  970470-3233  fralick3@hotmail.com</p> <p>RE: I-70 Draft PEIS Comments</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>I attended the I-70 PEIS meeting held in Avon, on January 26, 2005. Each of the alternatives presented in the Draft PEIS were very compelling. I am especially interested in the mass transit alternatives for solving the congestion problems on this particular stretch of I-70. Unfortunately, I am concerned that ridership on a train or bus would be limited. Weekend warriors interested in (skiing, hunting, kayaking, biking, canoeing, fly fishing, camping, climbing, backpacking etc.), may not choose mass transit options because:</p> <p>1. These people would have to change from one bus/train to another. In doing so they would have to</p>	Written

carry, stow, and transfer a significant amount of gear and equipment between the transportation modes.

2. It is unlikely that a bus or shuttle system would be able to get people to their specific trail heads, camp sites, gaming areas, rivers, etc.

Outdoor enthusiasts will choose to drive their cars because mass transit will be impractical. These outdoor enthusiasts will continue to be the main cause of congestion on this stretch of I-70. Widening the highway to 6 lanes or adding reversible lanes would help to relieve the current problem. Unfortunately, both of these solutions are short term.

I believe that it would be advantageous to implement a simple alternative. This alternative would be similar to your rail alternative. The only modification to this option would be to add a special transport line outfitted with double decked rail cars that could carry automobiles and people. Some of the advantages of an automobile transport system beyond the proposed mass transit alternative are as follows:

1. Once people reach their destination aboard the transport they would have their vehicle. They could then take their vehicles to any desired location in the mountains, with all of their equipment.

2. Motorists driving "cross country" would be able to use this transport system.

3. People that live in the mountains would be able to take the transport and use their cars to travel conveniently along the front range in Denver, Boulder, Colorado Springs, Ft. Collins, Pueblo, etc.

4. An enhanced mass transit system along the train line would not be as important.

5. Fewer vehicles on the highway.

The transport line would operate between two stops: C-470 in Denver, and Silverthorne. Separate passenger only trains, on the same track would make additional intermediate stops, as presented in your rail alternative.

There are similar transport trains currently in operation in North America. These existing systems can carry 16 automobiles on three double decked train cars. With slight modifications, it is feasible, and beneficial to further investigate this alternative. The biggest modification would be to create an efficient system for loading and unloading the 16 vehicles so that passengers would not have to wait very long at the transport train stations.

Additional transport trains could be put into operation during holiday weekends, advanced high speed options could be developed as ridership increases, and funding becomes available. The transport line could also be extended as needed to the east or west. Semi truck transports could also be developed.

This unique mountain corridor has difficult transportation constraints. A unique solution is required. Please feel free to contact me at (970) 470-3233.

Sincerely

Peter Fralick

cc: Chris Paulsen, CDOT  
Jean Wallace, FHWA  
J.F. Sato and Associates

Categorized Comment	143	Frank, Norman	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Norman Frank. I live in Clear Creek. I'm concerned that a metered gauge single track -- not dual track, single-track round rail wasn't considered as an alternative. I don't understand why. With the cog going up and over the divide, it's affordable. It's doable. It exists in the mountains of Europe, going into the mountains and onto sea areas and into small towns. It could stop in small towns.</p> <p>I think it would not only provide transportation alternatives throughout this century and into the next, but it also would become, I think, a significant tourist attraction that would provide economic boost to the restaurants and to the ski areas and to the rest of the local businesses in the I-70 corridor.</p> <p>This isn't an original thought by me. Ed Bright wrote a book called Smart Transit a few years ago. He was an aeronautical engineer retired from the Air Force. He lives in the Front Range. He laid it out from an engineering point of view in a very analytical manner. And I would urge any of you to get a copy of the book. I've talked a lot about it in the past.</p> <p>Six-laning I-70 will ultimately not relieve the congestion during peak times. I think that all of us that live here know that.</p> <p>I guess that's it. Everything else that I wanted to say has already been said two or three times. And it's great to see everybody here.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	377	French, Bob	Counties	2/23/2005	<p>Okay, I'm Bob French. I'm a Summit County commissioner.</p> <p>We all know that something has to be done. I have local interests. The ski areas, the factory stores, people need to get back and forth. The fastest we can look at data and charts and PEIS -- all night long and for the rest of the month, it is pretty clear that what needs to be done is an expansion of the highway to preserve a 65-mile-an-hour speed limit.</p> <p>And I absolutely agree with the previous speakers that preserving an option for rapid transit is absolutely essential. The first thing to do is to expand the highway to keep the traffic moving. Rapid transit will not help Keystone or Breckenridge. And trying to change the car culture in the next five or ten years strikes me as an unrealistic expectation.</p> <p>But I have a larger interest. I-70 runs from Baltimore to the middle of Utah, 2500 miles. We're one percent of that problem. This is a major interstate artery. We need to be able to keep the traffic moving. I do not believe that starting out with a rapid transit alternative before expanding the highway is going to get the cars off the road to allow that traffic to keep moving. We can build rapid transit when the times comes, but for the moment, we need to expand.</p> <p>And for those who are concerned about footprints, I lend you to the example Glenwood Canyon, which was -- as you will recall, the solution was way too expensive, never going to work, engineering was absolutely out of the question. And now people come from all over the world to admire the solution that we put together out there. So let's do that.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	351	Frey, Gary	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Good evening. My name is Gary Frey. I'm here to provide comments on the programmatic environmental impact statement and the expansion of I-70 corridor. I'm here on behalf of myself.</p> <p>My interests in this project stem from my continuing concern over the decline of the fishery resources in Colorado and from my having served on CDOT's committee for the SWEEP program -- Stream and Wetland Ecological Enhancement Program, representing Trout Unlimited, which regrettably became a meaningless exercise that was abruptly terminated by the Department of Transportation before it was allowed to complete its mission.</p> <p>I have extensive experience in managing projects under the National Environmental Policy Act. Having been a federal environmental manager for three federal agencies. I've prepared numerous EISs, including the first programmatic document for the central Arizona project filed with the Council of Environmental Quality in 1972. In that regard, I've reviewed this document and find that it does not rise to the standard of a programmatic EIS in a number of regards.</p> <p>The programmatic EIS does not identify and display alternatives in the manner needed to meet the spirit and intent of NEPA. The strategy presented in the PEIS is for CDOT to display 21 alternatives with any one of ten of them being a preferred alternative. Federal Highways and CDOT will then receive public comment in an extended comment period.</p> <p>And only after that comment period is over will the CDOT and Federal Highways disclose its proposed actions and allow for a meaningless 30-day comment period on the decision. This approach does not rise to the spirit and intent of NEPA, requiring agencies to disclose what their proposal is to allow for meaningful public input.</p> <p>Displaying ten alternatives as possible preferred alternatives does not allow the public a meaningful way to comment on whatever the preferred alternative is. Ten alternatives are far too many to deal with at a programmatic level. If after five years of study CDOT is not willing to display for public consumption what they have already decided to do, then it is appropriate for Federal Highways to require CDOT to identify its proposal and publish it in a supplemental EIS. That would be the only way in which the public has a meaningful opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Another troubling point with regard to alternatives is a lack of public display of how CDOT and Federal Highways will compare the diverse consequences of these programmatic alternatives in selecting its final proposed action.</p> <p>Particularly troubling are statements that indicate dollar costs will control the final decisions without adequate consideration of the environmental impacts and values. The secondary area of major</p>	Transcripts

deficiency is cumulative impacts displayed in Chapter 4. For example, Section 4.2.1 identifies cumulative issues, one of which is recreation. But the issue is defined only in the context of organized, structured recreation-based facilities; that is, forests and parks.

The issue is too narrowly defined and needs to be expanded to include nonstructural recreational opportunities such as fishing which occur frequently along the I-70 corridor, particularly in the Clear Creek drainage. From a cumulative perspective, impacts to fishery-based recreation, particularly when complied with past losses, are substantial.

It is a well-known fact that the original construction of I-70 has had serious impacts on fish and fishing-based recreation. Impacts to streams' habitat, contamination of water from transportation-based events, and loss of access have all negatively impacted the resource, yet the definition of the recreation issue ignores all of these impacts and does not meet the NEPA standard for a programmatic EIS. Other examples will be forthcoming in written comments.

The discussion on endangered species fails to address the likely presence of Colorado greenback cutthroat trout in the Clear Creek drainage. While the greenback cutthroat is not listed on the endangered species list, it is undergoing an extensive reintroduction program as an alternative to a formal Section 7 compliance. We encourage CDOT to treat the Colorado greenback trout as an endangered species and identify it as so in the EIS.

While the document as presented appears to represent --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Let him finish.

GARY FREY: While the documents as presented appear to represent substantial amounts of work -- that is, meeting all the height and weight criterion common to EISs, it is clear from the content that substantial issues have been avoided because of their controversy.

Particularly annoying are the references to SWEEP. While there was a SWEEP program, it was never completed. In fact CDOT chose to abandon the program because it was becoming complicated and CDOT was not willing to invest any more time in it for fear it would take them in a direction they didn't want to go.

I'll truncate these comments a little bit in the interest of time. Developing site-specific mitigation for streams and wetlands will have no meaning without specific policy driving negotiations. That was one of the purposes for SWEEP, as explained by CDOT. As the planning process continues, CDOT is encouraged to restart SWEEP to fulfill a critical mitigation need before any final decisions are made.

Given the problems identified with display of alternatives -- failure to address cumulative impacts, failure to properly consider endangered species, and most importantly, failure to organize and display a decision matrix -- CDOT and FHWA will make a final decision. FHWA should develop and issue a supplemental draft EIS addressing these shortcomings and identifying specifically their proposed action.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	802	Frey, Gary	Public	2/16/2005	Public Hearing on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Expansion of the I-70 Corridor	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
					<p>February 16, 2005 Jefferson County Fairgrounds Golden, Colorado</p> <p>Good (evening/afternoon) my name is Gary Frey and I am here to provide comments on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on the Expansion of the I-70 Corridor. I am here on behalf of myself. My interests in this project stem from my continuing concern over the decline of the fishery resource in Colorado and from my having served on the CDOT committee for the SWEEP program, which became a meaningless exercise that was abruptly terminated by the Department of Transportation before it was allowed to complete its mission.</p> <p>I have extensive experience in managing projects under the National Environmental Policy Act, having been a federal environmental manager for three federal agencies. I have prepared numerous EIS' including the first programmatic document, for the Central Arizona Project, filed with the Council on Environmental Quality in 1972. Based on that experience I have reviewed the Federal Highway Administration's draft document and find that it does not rise to the standard of a programmatic EIS in a number of regards.</p> <p>The programmatic EIS does not identify and display alternatives in the manner needed to meet the spirit and intent of NEPA. The strategy presented in the PEIS is for CDOT to display 21 alternatives, with any one of 10 of them being the preferred alternative. FHWA/CDOT will then receive public comment, in an extended comment period, and only after that comment period is over will the CDOT and FHWA disclose its' proposed action and allow for a meaningless 30 day comment period on the decision. This approach does not rise to the spirit and intent of the NEPA requiring agencies to disclose what their proposal is, to allow for meaningful public input.</p> <p>Displaying 10 alternatives as a possible preferred alternative does not allow the public a meaningful way to comment on whatever the preferred alternative is. Ten alternatives are far too many to deal with, programmatic level. If, after 5 years of study, CDOT is not willing to display for public consumption what it has already decided to do, then it is appropriate that the FHWA require CDOT to identify its proposal and publish it in a supplemental draft of the PEIS. That will be the only way in which the public has a meaningful opportunity to comment on the proposed action. While other agencies of the federal government have published draft EIS' without a proposed action these strategies are often exposed for what they are, an effort to dodge serious public input and deflect meaningful public criticism.</p> <p>Another troubling point is a definite lack of public display on how CDOT/FHWA will compare the diverse consequences of these programmatic alternatives in selecting its' final proposed action. Particularly troubling are statements that indicate dollar cost will control the final decision(s) without adequate consideration of environmental impacts as balancing factors. FHWA/CDOT need to develop a decision matrix showing how it balanced key factors in coming to the conclusions of eliminating the alternatives shown as "not preferred" and how it will carry that strategy forward in coming to a final decision on a proposed action.</p> <p>A second area of major deficiency is Cumulative Impacts (see Chapter 4.0). For example, Section 4.2.1 identifies cumulative issues; one issue is Recreation, but the issue is defined only in the context of organized, structured recreation-based facilities, i.e. forests and parks. The issue is too narrowly defined and needs to be expanded to include non-structured recreational opportunities such as fishing which occurs frequently along the I70 Corridor, particularly in the Clear Creek drainage. From a cumulative perspective impacts to fishery-based recreation, particularly when complied with past losses, are substantial. It is a well known fact that original construction of I-70 has had serious impacts on fish and fishery based recreation. Impacts to stream habitat, contamination of water from transportation based events, and loss of access have all negatively impacted the resource. Yet the definition of the recreation issue ignores all of these facts. Again, this is just one example of how the discussion of cumulative impacts does not meet the NEPA standard for a programmatic EIS. Other examples will be forthcoming in written comments.</p> <p>The discussion on Endangered Species fails to address the likely presence of Colorado Greenback Cutthroat Trout in the Clear Creek drainage. While the Greenback Cutthroat is not listed on the endangered species list it is undergoing an extensive reintroduction program as an alternative to a formal Section 7/Section 10 consultation process with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Consequently the greenback has a special status within the Colorado fish resource community and should be considered as having protection under the Endangered Species Act. A narrowly based interpretation of the Endangered Species Act does not serve the Colorado Community well at all. In addition, it is ludicrous that one State agency, the Division of Wildlife, is making a Herculean effort to save the greenback while another, the Colorado Department of Transportation is aggressively taking steps to narrow its potential habitat.</p> <p>Winter Maintenance and Water Quality are major concerns, and the preferred alternatives rank as the worst choices for these criteria. Additional Highway lanes will cause damage from increased need for Traction Sand and De-icers as well as from the enlarged "footprint". Traction Sand has caused tremendous degradation to water quality and habitat along Clear Creek, Straight Creek, the Blue River, Black Core Creek, Gore Creek and the Eagle River. The PEIS sites mitigation detailed in two SCAP's (Sediment Control Action Plans) as adequate mitigation measures. However, these mitigation measures will only recover 25% to 80% of sand applied each year. The most likely "best case" scenario is 50%. The reality, by CDOT's own admission, is less, and then only if the millions of dollars required are there. That still leaves thousands of tons of Traction Sand working into the streams each year. Also, neither the PEIS nor the SCAP's address the problem from salt (Sodium Chloride) used to prevent "caking" in the sand. The total volume of sand is comprised of 5% salt (NaCl).</p> <p>While the document as presented appears to represent substantial amounts of work (meeting all the height and weight criteria common to EIS) it is clear from the content that substantial issues have been avoided because of their controversy. Particularly annoying are the references to SWEEP. While there was a SWEEP program; it was never completed. In fact, CDOT chose to abandon the program because it was becoming complicated and CDOT was not willing to invest any more time in it for fear it would take them in a direction they didn't want to go. Consequently, any recommendations attributed to SWEEP are erroneous as that process was never completed. To my knowledge there is no public consensus on any conclusions reached through the SWEEP process. The EIS makes vague reference to SWEEP as being reinstated during the development of site specific EIS'. But, that will be analogous to closing the barn door after the livestock have left. Developing site specific mitigation for streams and wetlands will have no meaning without specific policy driving the negotiations. That was one of the</p>	

purposes for SWEEP as explained by CDOT.

Given the problems identified with display of alternatives, failure to address cumulative impacts properly, failure to properly consider endangered species and, most importantly, failure to organize and display a decision-making matrix identifying how CDOT and FHWA will make a final decision, FHWA should develop and issue a supplemental Draft EIS, addressing these shortcomings and identifying, specifically, their proposed action.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Categorized Comment	98	Friend, Richard	Public	1/12/2005	<p>I am in favor of 2 proposals:</p> <p>1) the 6 lane hwy and future rail transit median 2) 6 lane with AGS</p> <p>I'm not sure Western independence will embrace the rail feature yet - they might later.</p> <p>I also want to say that I'm impressed with the way TRex on I-25 has progressed. I realize construction is a painful process, but to keep 6 lanes open most of the time during all the construction is a coordination mess I'm sure. If I-70 can remain open during construction as well and CDOT will promise that, then business and commuters will become more in favor of your proposal.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	118	Fuller, Gilbert	Public	1/19/2005	<p>I had a couple of comments. Gilbert Fuller, 3198 Elm Avenue, Grand Junction.</p> <p>I was just thinking, we need to take a long-term view of this, and partly because construction is such a disruptive factor, to make it wide enough now, so not 25 years, but looking at 75 to 100 years, and make it four lanes each way, and suck up the expense and do it right.</p> <p>The other is, there's going to be a lot of technology in the future, cars are going to become much more efficient, there's going to be higher gas mileages, and so the interstate system will become more effective, more efficient, in the future, looking 25, 30 years down the road.</p> <p>The other thing is there's probably going to be technology where there's computer-controlled cars, they'll put wires and guidelines in the systems, and people will just go on, turn on the automatic system, and it will drive you to Denver by yourself, and that could be 20, 30 years from now, or even sooner. I think the technology already exists.</p> <p>So if you look at the technology changes, the interstate system will become more and more efficient and safer. The cars will be safer and more fuel efficient.</p> <p>So I don't see any real need for buses and monorails, particularly if you're going to spend multiple billions of dollars. If you look at technology and the future of the car, everyone will benefit more by making a suitable interstate, and then 50 years from now we'll look back and say, yeah, we did it right, and everybody should benefit.</p> <p>Thanks a lot, I appreciate it.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	114	Fuller, Gilbert	Public	1/19/2005	<p>I had kind of a thought, and I was wondering if anybody else agrees. Why is it that interstates and highways are just crucial for 49 states?</p> <p>And I think we should stick with it, but I was thinking if you're going to do it and mess traffic up for 15 years, why not make it eight lanes and get through something, you know?</p> <p>Make it right, to the knock of 100 years, because then you could make it out of concrete instead of asphalt.</p> <p>And, you know, they can grind up tires. The asphalt question to me is -- that might be a problem, but it's not a significant problem, because there's plenty of shale that they make asphalt out of, and there's plenty of tires you can grind up and do it. Or you can make it out of concrete.</p> <p>Because this corridor is so important and construction is such a hassle, make it eight lanes, and, you know, do it right for 100 years instead of -- make it big enough so we can have no congestion for quite a while.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	604	G. Martin	Public	5/24/2005	<p>I-70 needs to change. I believe that a monorail would be the best option for making that change happen. I know that I-70 is very congested and too much energy is being used just on that highway. If we leave the situation alone, then nothing is going to get better and the problem is going to go unsolved. I know that cars use energy and creating a double-decker or widening the highway will allow for more cars to travel on the highway and more cars equals more pollution. Monorail uses electricity and therefore uses less energy. It could attract more tourists and therefore could help the economy.</p> <p>I-70 is very congested and most of the options are not very wise decisions. The bus lane would be bad because buses use diesel gas and that type of gas is very bad for the environment. The expanding of the highway and the double-decker highway would also consume energy as well because as I said before, more cars equals more gas. The combination of all would just double the energy usage. These options are not options that we want.</p> <p>Expanding the highway just allows for some leeway for a while until more cars pile in and the congestion rises all over again. It would help bring more cars and more pollution to add to the brown haze that hangs like a curtain above Denver. Historical sites would be destroyed and or lose its meaning if the highway is expanded. No one wants to stop on the side of the highway to look at sites due to the excess traffic that would occur and all the noise that would drive people to pass on by them and oohh and aahh at them as they drive by for a few seconds. Idaho springs would mostly be destroyed and dinosaur ridge could possibly be affected and maybe even wiped over by the expanded highway.</p> <p>Double-decker and bus lane highway is not a good option either. We want an option that uses less energy. Buses use diesel gas and double-decker highways use every other type of gas and pollutes the skies. We already are known for the pollution that is above the city. We don't want it to be worse than it already is.</p> <p>I have come to address some of the questions and statements that you might have. "The bus lane would keep some of the drivers off the street." Well if you think about it buses use diesel gas (have I said that before?) and that would be more hazardous to the environment. "Oh well the double-decker would leave 6 lanes for each direction of traffic." That would be more cars for the highway as well and it would put more gas into the air (hmm daejavuu). "The combination of the three options would give the people a little of both" but it would triple all the pollution.</p> <p>Monorail would use less energy as far as gas goes and is better for the environment. We need to think about the future and if we choose any of the options explained above then none of the issues in the future would be addressed.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	606	G. Martin	Public	5/24/2005	<p>Hello I am a student in expeditionary learning high school one of the first expeditionary learning schools in Colorado.</p> <p>Well when I started this project I did not know anything about it except that they wanted to expand the highway, in the beginning was all into expanding because I did not know anything but know that I am educated I have an educated guess on what decision they can make based on water resources.</p> <p>Based on my knowledge and my resources I have come up with the conclusion that the "AGS" advanced guide way system would have the most minimal affect to the water resources in those areas the "AGS" is the second least "impact to the water resources next to minimal action. The three sources of major pollution with are impact of highway runoff and winter roadway maintenance activities on water quality. Disturbance of historic mine waste materials due to construction activities of the project alternatives that might cause the release of contaminants (such as heavy metals) to streams potential additional impacts on water quality impaired streams and streams with classifications and standards requiring special consideration affect on stream stability hydraulic function system health and riparian system indirect impacts spills and hazardous materials transport possibility of releasing contaminants into nearby waterways development and urbanization possibly resulting in impacts on water quality and streams channelization and other changes to streams morphology." according to the PEIS .</p> <p>For me this means that the "AGS" is the only solution to protect our water resources our water resources are the thing that hold us alive they are very important to every one in Colorado people who are down stream from the mountain corridor will drink that water - the wildlife environment would be changed drastically if our water resources were polluted</p> <p>If our water resources continue to be polluted then I would think that no money would fix the damage we have done it would be tragic for our future to have to live with polluted water resources and have to act on consequences when we could have done some thing to protect it</p> <p>The "AGS" system is the only option that would uphold our water resources and environment. Please make my opinion and research the correct decision</p> <p>Martin G</p>	Online

Categorized Comment	320	Gallaher, Dave	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Well, I'm the last speaker. I didn't plan to stand up. I'm Dave Gallaher from River Gulch. I'm an oil and gas geologist along I-70. I'm also an environmental scientist. I've written a bunch of these PEISs. I'm now the information director for Jefferson County.</p> <p>I've got to say, I've read the EIS. It represents bad science and it represents bad strategy. This is not [INAUDIBLE DUE TO APPLAUSE] -- jump into the largest ski area in Europe, this ski area has a -- is bigger than all the ski areas in Colorado combined. It's Zermatt, Switzerland. I was just there. It has no highway to that ski area at all. There is no highway. You cannot drive there. You have to go by train. It works. There is no traffic jams. I got up in the morning, get on the train, and it gets you there. No problem. This thing spans two countries for crying out loud, and they did it, why can't we? This is a damn road -- that rail was put in 50 years ago.</p> <p>Second thing, you keep talking about subsidies. You can't subsidize the rail system. What are we paying to subsidize the roads? Get real. We're going to pave this thing at \$100,000 a mile every five years, which subsidy is that? What is that coming out of the tax funds that will pay? Why couldn't that go to something that we're going to use?</p> <p>The road's given me some insecurity. Put it into the rail system where we can get some real value out of it. It would last 30 or 20 years.</p> <p>This gas issue -- as an oil and gas geologist, this AAPG, the American Association of Petroleum Geology, said you got 25 years. So down the road, 25 years when the oil runs out -- and that's the AAPG. These are really conservative geologists. [INAUDIBLE DUE TO COUGHING].</p> <p>Third point, you know, get rid of the bottlenecks. Do some of the obvious steps, but leave the road as it is now. There's no point in doing this. Build the rail and scrap the six lanes. Just don't do it. It makes no sense.</p> <p>Lastly, doing the PEIS -- I've done these PEISs. Give the real costs of the health impacts. The PEIS does not address that. It kind of dances around the subject, but you've got to say what this is going to cost. If you add up the total cost to the communities, \$6 billion doesn't look so crappy anymore.</p> <p>And lastly, you used to be known as the Colorado Highway Department. By golly, I think you still are. It's supposed to be the Colorado Department of Transportation. I've heard too much discussion on. We don't want to be in the transit business. If you don't want to be in the transit business, turn it over to someone else who does. There's lots of private sector firms who will do this if you can't.</p> <p>You need to think outside the box a little bit. There are better ways to do this, and there's a lot of folks who have done this. Okay. If it turns out the highway is too horrible, go with regular rail. I mean, our forefathers did it 100 years ago without too much trouble. There's got to be someone willing to do this. We can get there.</p> <p>The guideway looks like the best way. But open your eyes, check things out a little bit. This should not be the end of all that. A standard [INAUDIBLE] that you had the decision made before you got into the process.</p> <p>[INAUDIBLE DUE TO APPLAUSE] the PEIS. It can be done; I've done them.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	418	Geiseneurfer, Lew Paul	Public	2/26/2005	<p>Low Paul Geiseneurfer. I'm here as a concerned citizen. I'm at large. That means they haven't caught me yet. People that have addressed you, it's kind of a hard act to follow, but I would like to follow up on a couple of comments.</p> <p>Someone quoted Abraham Lincoln. Well, he was one of my idols also. But I forget which address it was. I believe it was of his second inaugural address. If we can first judge where we are and what we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it.</p> <p>And the second one was John F Kennedy in the race to the moon. And I don't know if many people even knew about this, but his idea was to get the most qualified people in all these different fields that would be needed, and his instruction was: I don't want anyone on any of these teams, and especially the leaders, that doesn't believe it can't be done. That's the key to anything that we do. We've got to believe it can be done; otherwise, we're defeated.</p> <p>And I had one comment about bashing and bias and emotion. Well, really, I think we all have the right to be biased. We have the right to be biased towards our own interest, but not too much. And I think that everybody in this room expects government to be biased. We just don't want it to get too biased, especially concerning eminent domain and doing things that they shouldn't do. And who does the government belong to? We are the government and we have met the enemy, and quite often the enemy is us. But we need to get together on this.</p> <p>And Mr. Hudson, I think your comments are well taken and you have the right to say I told you so, but that doesn't help. And believe me, I know that. When you foresee something 10, 20, 30 years ahead and it fails and all of the sudden they say, Well, some guy told us this before, you don't ever want to say I told you so. You want to support what happens to make it go better.</p> <p>But we need to broaden the scope. And, you know, they say 50 years, that's fine, but a lot of places are requiring proof and evidence of water supply not only for 50 but 100 years, and some places say 500 to 1,000. Well, life is uncertain. We know that. You know, life is dynamic, and unless you've got a better crystal ball than I do, we can't see what's going to happen for certain tomorrow or next week. And it's dynamic. And as long as we have roads and have to use them, we're going to have construction.</p> <p>And I want to compliment both the federal and state DOT on -- we've learned a great deal on all the mistakes we have made, and they do a very excellent job now of controlling construction so that we can live with the flow. You know, if we want the improvements, we have to give and take a little too. You know, go with the rules and so on -- am I up already?</p> <p>AMY: No. You have a minute and a half.</p> <p>LEW PAUL GEISENEURFER: Anyway, I think we need to improve the scope. And we have problems in this whole state. And if I can see any of the future at all, this state is going to continue to grow. And what the Fraser librarian said runs a very tight ship. I know, because when I don't return a book, I get a letter and then a phone call; then I get -- I won't call it a threat. If I don't -- if I don't return it in so many days, I'll have to pay for it. Well, it's only money. It doesn't bother me much. I don't have any, so it doesn't make any difference. But what would really get me to return it was to threaten to cut me off of the library. And we've done a great job of that in Grand County.</p> <p>And, you know, our future here is you young people. And I talked to some of you earlier on. Don't be afraid to say your opinions. You have as much right as any of us. And like Ms. Sorensen said, you're the ones that's not only going to have to pay for it -- most of it, but you're the ones that are going to have to live with the mistakes we make.</p> <p>And, you know, it's -- I've tried different things, and most of my life has been a whole series of failures, but hopefully I've learned from some of it. And I thank you for listening, but let's go forward with this.</p> <p>And there may be all kinds of negative lawsuits in attempts to delay or get more for one area than another. I don't know that. But we have federal precedence where we can go to the federal court and get orders to proceed and quit delaying things forever. Let's agree on something and get it done. And if there are cases that are considered worthy of notice, fine, let them settle those after we start working on them, not to stop it in the middle. And we can do it.</p> <p>And Clear Creek, I have interest there too, as well as in Grand County. I may not own anything. I may owe a lot of money, but I'm still interested in it. Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	740	Geoghegan, Kasey	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address. 513 Belford Avenue Frisco CO 80443</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	551	Gerace, Shantell	Public	5/23/2005	<p>C-dot wants to try something new to I-70. They were thinking of putting a mono rail, bus guideway system, and expand I-70 to a six lane highway. From my point of view I think they should leave I-70 alone.</p> <p>I think that should leave it alone because changing the highway will cause constuction. And the constuction will cause bad traffic. In order to do constuction they will have to need equipment to cut the roads etc...And the equipment will take up the room so the cars would have have to cut in and out of the cones that they set will have to set up. It will take them up to 15 yrs just to build. 15 yrs of backed up traffic. That's TO much time to be working on the highway just because they think it will decrease traffic. Another reason why I think They shoudn't do nothing to change I-70</p> <p>I think changing the highway will affect the people who live and work around it because then they would have to cut down animals homes (trees), peoples homes, and where people work to expand I-70.</p>	Online

Categorized Comment	283	Gerhart, Paul	Public	3/9/2005	<p>Your website is not allowing me to pull up any of the parts of the Draft PEIS Online. The message merely states the pate is not available.</p> <p>Please e-mail me when this is fixed.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	728	Gilman, James	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>J. Gilman, jgilman@msn.com, 535 Dahlia St., Denver, CO 80220 - I received the email about this on 4 May - could not reply by 3 May! Need earlier communications before deadlines.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	328	Gilstrap, Keith	Public	2/12/2005	<p>Keith Gilstrap, G-i-l-s-t-r-a-p, from Glenwood Springs. And I live in Glenwood Springs and own a transportation company for hazardous materials. And I was wondering if they were going to address the need to possibly get the hazardous materials into the Eisenhower Tunnels with the new alignment of the I-70 corridor and off of the U.S. 6/Loveland Pass. Because 30 years ago they implemented that when the tunnels were first built. And since that time, well over a hundred trucks have crashed up there with environmental issue, public safety, and health, not to mention this should be a scenic byway not a hazardous materials byway.</p> <p>So if we are going to realign I-70, we would like see if we can get the hazardous materials some communication through the Eisenhower tunnels save some of that U.S. 6 for other uses besides Hazmat. That didn't have much to do with the I-70 corridor but I think it is closely involved with that with U.S. 6 as a bypass, because we are using the No Name Tunnels for the same use and thousands of Hazmat trucks run through there. And I don't see why we can't use th Eisenhower tunnels because there is no other alternative for the No Name Tunnels. And if they use Cottonwood Pass, that would be the same thing. They are going to make us go that way.</p> <p>Those are my comments and I would appreciate. You can reach me at P.O. Box 1061 in Rifle, Colorado 81650. Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	421	Gilco Transportation, Inc.	Associations & Special Interest Groups	3/10/2005	<p>GILCO TRANSPORTATION, INC. P.O. Box 1061 Rifle, CO 81650 (970) 625-0797 (970) 625-0797 (Fax)</p> <p>March 10, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager CO Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>RE: I-70 Corridor; Transportation Route US 6, Loveland Pass Date of Public Hearing: February 12, 2005</p> <p>Dear Cecelia:</p> <p>As an active participant in and spokesperson of the Hazmat Transportation industry in the Western Slope region, I would like to express our serious concern regarding our current transportation route across Loveland Pass on US 6. We consider it important, for safety and environmental reasons, to take the heavy Fuel tanker trucks off the dangerously steep and narrow US 6, Loveland Pass. There are several much safer and more economic solutions for the industry's transportation routes over the mountains, which we would like to discuss.</p> <p>We are required to use the dangerous Loveland Pass because we are not allowed to utilize the much safer Eisenhower Tunnel. We understand the implication associated with taking fuel trucks through tunnel. However, our trucks are allowed to use the slightly shorter Hanging Lake Tunnels near Glenwood Springs. Our industry records several thousand accident-free trips per year through this tunnel. Based on this excellent record, the Eisenhower Tunnel should be made accessible For our industry as well. This change would spare our industry and our precious environment the risk of accidents along the dangerously steep and narrow Loveland Pass. Recognized industry and traffic experts concur with our judgment that the logistics of this positive change can be worked out.</p> <p>Since your office is currently evaluating and considering traffic related issues along the I70 corridor, we would like to have an opportunity to discuss with you our ideas for safe and environmentally advantageous solutions.</p> <p>Please contact me at the above office number or on my cell phone concerning the above matter. My cell number is (970) 618-0484. I look forward to hearing from you and eventually working with you on a possible solution.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Keith D. Gilstrap President</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	198	Girardot, Jan	Public	2/17/2005	<p>Your dismissing rail options is very disappointing and short-sighted. Steel rails can carry far more people that automobiles ever have.</p> <p>Wake up!</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	574	Glover, Lucy	Public	5/24/2005	<p>I do not think widening I-70 for automobile use is a viable solution. I think that some type of mass transit is the best solution for our future needs.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	750	Glover, Lucy	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	761	Glover, Randy	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>6-laning is a 10 year solution that takes 15 years -- a complete waste even without considering the adverse conditions for 15 years. WE MUST THINK OUTSIDE THE CAR!!!</p>	Written

Categorized Comment	491	Glover, Randy	Public	5/13/2005	3.19.2.1.b says standard design will be used. 3.19.2.1.c says context sensitive design principles will be used. I prefer context sensitive design. Delete the conflicting standard design phrase.	Online
Categorized Comment	494	Glover, Randy	Public	5/13/2005	THINK OUTSIDE THE CAR! Think beyond cars and buses. Every major transportation advance in our nation's history has required government subsidy. We need a major advance -- not more of the same! If you require something specific, go for the monorail!	Online
Categorized Comment	92	Goodtimes, Art	Public	1/23/2005	I've reviewed the Draft PEIS and I think we're on the right track from a planning standpoint. We need to get to implementation.  The I-70 Corridor is critical to bring visitors/tourists to our remote resort community. I would like to urge you to move forward in the legislative arena to find appropriate funding for the final transportation option selected.	Form
Categorized Comment	384	Gordon, Marshall	Public	2/23/2005	Marshall Gordon, and I'm a resident of Vail -- the Vail area, which I have been for five years. I've been skiing Vail since it opened in 1962, and I've been coming every year since. And I've owned property in the Vail area since 1975.  I have a background that I think gives me insight into some of these problems, if I may say. One of them is the -- first of all, I went to school in Southern California in the early '60s when it was paradise and when 14,000 people a day were moving into Southern California. Everybody wanted to be there. And I saw what happened to Southern California.  I also did -- I worked ten states for Red Lobster as a representative, ten states in 30 cities. I think that's relevant, because the first thing I would do is, when I would come into a market, I'd drive the town and try to understand how it worked. And then I'd go see the planner to understand what was going on.  I've been involved in Leawood, Kansas, with the Tomahawk Creek Parkway, which had a major effect of re -- I say revitalizing. It wasn't revitalizing. But Leawood, Kansas, is a very prosperous community that had only residential development, and they felt they needed to get additional development -- non-residential development. I was involved in the Tomahawk Creek Estate joint venture, which is a high-priced, gated community, and it involved an office development along the parkway, including the first six-story office building.  As far as what is the problem, I think that -- I think we're already behind the eight ball. I think that it's only going to get worse. I think one of the biggest problems is obviously going to be the cost of the project. All you have to do is look at the terrain. And I think one of the problems also is that we're looking at this as a problem only facing the mountain communities, and I don't think that's the case.  I think that the I-70 corridor is very important to the Front Range and that Denver would -- we would not see the vitality and the growth in Denver that we have seen without I-70. And I think that the Front Range, particularly the Denver area, should be very much concerned. And I think they should also assist in payment on this. I just think that's the only thing that makes sense.  The -- I had one recent experience which I think is relevant. I drove from San Francisco to Napa Valley, a distance of 61 miles over -- it was Washington's birthday, and it took five and a half hours to go those 61 miles. Okay. Well, I see I only have two minutes. I have a lot more to go into, which I can follow up in correspondence, I guess.  I believe that transportation and reasonable access is the lifeblood not only to a community but to this whole region. The Denver market I've already said, is very important and will be affected by it. And that if what I see is happening, we're going to lose access to the Rocky Mountains and reasonable -- in the time frame. And I think that should be a big concern to the Denver market, the Front Range, as long -- as well as mountain communities.  Financing. I'll just touch on that. Obviously, they're going to be huge. The cost of financing is going to be huge, and I don't think you can do this through normal financing. The federal government will help some, of course, because of the interstate highway. But they're not going to solve the problem. And I think that users of the corridor will have to pay a part of the expense.  My example is the Florida market. I had the opportunity to go to Florida from time to time, particularly the Orlando area. And they're very successful with their toll roads paying for that sort of thing.  I think it will take a public awareness -- the awareness of the whole public. It will also require an economic study to show the benefit and the needs. And I think the problem is comparable to what happened in the Golden Gate Bridge in Northern California. I think it was like the 1920s where the whole public became aware that they would need a major bridge that would have to be supported by the whole metropolitan area, and they were willing to mortgage their homes to help pay for that.  Okay. I'm out of time, obviously. The only thing is -- I don't like -- I would prefer to not see a 2025 time frame. I'd like to see what's going to happen in the next ten years, because I think it's going to become a major problem in that time frame.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	297	Gould, Suzanna	Public	2/9/2005	Good evening. My name is Suzanna Gould. I'm a resident of Idaho Springs, and also a member of the Open Space Clear Creek Commission.  The Clear Creek County Open Space Commission has serious concerns regarding the I-70 corridor draft programmatic environmental impact statement.  Thoughtful consideration -- (Interruption by cell phone.)  UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Start over.  SUZANNA GOULD: -- established by a vote of the people in 1999. Clear Creek County residents approved a one-mill property levy to support an open space commission dedicated to creating and reserving open space, recreation, and the unique historic character of their community.  With the tireless effort of its volunteer commission and a small operating budget, just sufficient enough to provide for one part-time staffer and leverage grant, Clear Creek County Open Space Commission is in the process of developing some significant recreational opportunities identified by the Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030 to improve its quality of life and local economy. As you know, the Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030, adopted January 21, 2004, identifies the development of the Clear Creek greenway and specific objectives on the page 2-2.  In a previous letter to Mr. Kullman dated December 4, 2003, Clear Creek County Open Space Commission asked for project support from CDOT towards developing the Clear Creek greenway plan remarking the project will be an important planning tool, not only for the county but for CDOT and future highway development. In a follow-up letter from Mr. Kullman dated February 2, 2004, CDOT generously agreed to participate and contribute to the effort. Clear Creek County Open Space Commission is greatly appreciative and applauds CDOT's cooperation in the development of the Clear Creek greenway plan.  However, despite CDOT's awareness and participation in the development of this plan, there is no specific mention of its development in the I-70 mountain corridor draft PEIS under Section 3.10.2.5, Clear Creek County. Likewise, the greenway is only referenced in its conceptual format as the greenway initiative in regards to the Clear Creek Master Plan 2030, Section 3.14.2, recreation resources.  Clear Creek County Open Space Commission is currently scheduled to complete the development of the Clear Creek greenway plan in May of 2005, which will have a continuous bike trail and associated river-oriented recreational facilities along the entire stretch of Clear Creek within the county. Since the plan is expected to provide the basic groundwork investment leading to significant economic, social improvement, considering the limiting terrain of this county, impacts to the greenway should be considered as a part of the Tier I PEIS process.  Without proper evaluation of the environmental, cultural and construction impacts, the PEIS alternatives to the Clear Creek County greenway plan through the Tier I PEIS process, economic, social, and recreational investments identified as priorities for the Clear Creek Master Plan 2030 run the risk of being adversely affected or prematurely precluded from future implementation.  Clear Creek County Open Space Commission further requests that, as an early action item, CDOT assist with the construction of the Clear Creek County greenway as soon as possible for A, mitigation of the future highway improvements; B, emergency access; and C, to provide for mobility and safety during highway construction by providing a multimodal corridor through Clear Creek County. Again, thoughtful consideration and response to these specific issues is greatly appreciated.  Clear Creek County and its open space commission look forward to working with the Colorado Department of Transportation to develop a corridor that sufficiently addresses various regional and local quality of life initiatives while meeting the travel demands of the future.	Transcripts



Thank you.

Categorized Comment	614	Graf, Bill	Public	5/24/2005	<p>Each of the major alternatives will cost much more in the future. Doing too little now will only make some of the better alternatives too expensive to be feasible in a decade or two. Rather than continuing to push more lanes of traffic which will attract more cars, we should move forward to a vision of a balanced transportation network, one that includes both road lanes and high speed rail. One goal should be for winter and summer tourists to be able to travel from DIA to the mountain resorts without renting cars. With metro area stations, assuming reasonable fares, locals will be drawn to the faster travel time. We can reduce the number of cars on I70 or at least slow traffic growth.</p> <p>If we include high speed rail in the I70 project, we can become a showcase for the entire country, perhaps the world. It will speak well of our love for our environment and our willingness to embrace new technology. It could help develop our economy in a new way.</p> <p>Elevated AGS should be able to be installed without the enormous widening discussed for adding multiple lanes of traffic. It could reduce the disruption (commercial and otherwise) during the construction phase.</p> <p>Let's do something first class that we, our children and their children can be proud of. Let's look beyond the low bid to include AGS or other high speed rail.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Bill Graf</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	58	Graham, David	Public	1/19/2005	<p>I am very impressed by the work that has already been done by everyone associated with this program. It is evident that there are many highly dedicated and well motivated individuals involved in all aspects of the project. It is my hope that they continue to contribute at the same level and see this project through to the best possible outcome. The best for the majority of citizens who are impacted by the project. The impact includes disruption to daily lives as the construction work is on going; the possible dislocation of people for right of way improvements; the mental anguish caused by the planning stages and not knowing what the outcome will be; and for those who don't get involved and wake up one morning to realize that the sound they hear is that of a bull dozer working outside their window.</p> <p>I don't know as much about the project as I would like, but I intend to change that and learn as much as possible. I want this project, and the improvements that it will bring. We need it and it is overdue. I intend to support the plan that earns final approval by doing what I can. Of the proposals that I have seen in the media, I prefer the one that uses an elevated portion where needed and would add that 2 reversible lanes makes the most sense to me.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	585	Graham, Michael	Public	5/24/2005	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I am writing to provide my comments regarding the I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS. I am currently a student at CU-Boulder studying accounting. I often use the I-70 corridor to access ski resorts in Summit County, Grand County, Eagle County, etc.</p> <p>I am dismayed by the fact that so little transit service exists to connect the Denver metro area with the mountain ski resorts. CU-Boulder provides a bus service on weekends for its students. Greyhound provides service between downtown Denver and various points along the I-70 Corridor, particularly Frisco and Vail. Besides these two services, the only way I could get from the Denver metro area to the mountain ski resorts without driving a private automobile is to take a private shuttle. These private shuttles probably cost over \$50 roundtrip, making them prohibitively expensive for many people. Also, these shuttles primarily focus on providing connections between the mountain resorts and DIA, neglecting other parts of the Denver metro area.</p> <p>Before CDOT spends billions of dollars to widen the highway or implement the Bus in Guideway alternative, CDOT should seriously consider ways to implement an inexpensive, down-to-earth transit alternative. CDOT should try running a subsidized bus service from the Morrison Park-and-Ride to the Frisco Park-and-Ride. From the Frisco Park-and-Ride, passengers could take the Summit Stage to resorts including Breckenridge and Copper Mountain. Additionally, CDOT should look at ways to encourage carpooling throughout the corridor. SkiCarpool.com is a privately run website that helps arrange carpooling to the ski resorts. Check it out: <a href="http://www.SkiCarpool.com">www.SkiCarpool.com</a>. CDOT should look for low-cost ways to support SkiCarpool.com and other ridesharing/ridematching services.</p> <p>To put it bluntly: don't spend Billions of dollars to bulldoze half of Idaho Springs and put more cars on the road and create more pollution. Instead, spend Millions of dollars to increase the capacity of the corridor by putting more people in each vehicle through a combination of subsidized bus service in mixed-traffic and support of ridesharing and ridematching services.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p> <p>Michael Graham 85 Jersey Street Denver CO 80220 303-377-8448</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	462	Grand County Board of Commissioners	Counties	4/19/2005	<p>April 19, 2005</p> <p>Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Aurora, Colorado 80011</p> <p>RE: I-70 Draft PEIS</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>Grand County has attended several of the I-70 PEIS presentations as well as hosted two, to try to illuminate our citizenry on the proposed project. After much consideration and discussion, we would like to officially offer the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First of all, Grand County would like the Colorado Department of Transportation to work in a more collaborative manner with the Department of Natural Resources and other State agencies that deal in water resources. The proposed improvements to the I-70 Corridor have as much or more impact on the finite water resources as they do on transportation. If the I-70 Corridor improvements are meant to move traffic, that means more growth to the headwater counties which requires more water to serve this need. Currently, all headwater counties are suffering from trans-basin diversions that are only planned to increase. Transportation and water are both matters of State interest and one should not be considered without considering the impacts to the other.</li> <li>2. There appears to be some substantial hidden costs for artery communities in the mass transit options. These should be thoroughly and completely explored before a mass transit option is included as part of the alternative.</li> <li>3. We realize that the alternative of rail transit through the Moffat Tunnel or other railways was discarded, but we believe that too should be given a re-evaluation before a decision is made.</li> <li>4. If the alternative chosen is constructing more lanes, we believe there should be three lanes on each side.</li> <li>5. The presentation highlighted that when the improvements have been completed, the estimated increased traffic will need to be again addressed. Therefore, it would seem ludicrous not to obtain all the right-of-way necessary, not only for today, but for 25 years from now. This would eliminate a great deal of chaos from property owners and communities.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for considering our comments. We appreciate the opportunity to comment and will continue to work with the Colorado Department of Transportation in all areas.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>James L. Newberry, Chairman Nancy Stuart, Commissioner Duane E. Dailey, Commissioner</p> <p>JLN:ke</p> <p>cc: Jean Wallace, P.E., Fed. Highway Admin. Gary Severson, I-70 Coalition</p>	Written

Categorized Comment	84	Gray, William	Municipalities	1/26/2005	<p>1. I did not see any thing addressing the snow removal for any of the different construction versions.</p> <p>2. The AGS looks to be the least impact in the initial phase and if the support columns were made to adapt for future road expansion, this would provide expansion with minimal impact in the future.</p> <p>3. What is the noise impact of the AGS system, and how would it perform in cold conditions?</p> <p>4. What is the travel speed of the AGS?</p> <p>5. Is there a way to intergrate commercial use of the AGS system?</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	85	Gray, William	Public	1/26/2005	<p>1. The population figures about minorities is way off.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	473	Greist, David	Public	4/26/2005	<p>Depart of Trans 1-70 Draft PEIS c/o J.F. Sato 5898 South Rapp Street Littleton, CO 80120</p> <p>A reversible HOV lane will go --- if the public cost stops there. Thus you swindle us, the taxpayers, unless you make construction conditional upon private (ski area) commitment to pay for the bus system. You need to lay the groundwork for said private operators to agree upon what % of each area's customers they will [lure thru subsidy] onto the HOV lane.</p> <p>David A. Greist</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	52	Griffith, Lynn	Public	1/18/2005	<p>I - 70 corridor</p> <p>Instead of widening or monorail, has any one considered a 2 route. Could call it c-570.</p> <p>Lynn Griffith teamconcepts2001@aol.com</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	417	Guerrero, Martin	Public	2/26/2005	<p>Hello everybody. My name is Martin, and I'm sorry I don't have much information. I just learned about this two hours ago. I think this is not going to affect you guys that much. It's going to affect our generation and kids and all that, so we're going to have to be the ones who will pay as much as you. We're going to be the ones who use it. And I don't have much to say.</p> <p>On behalf of Skyview Expeditionary Learning, we just know we're going to have a lot more things to say about it in the future months. There's going to be positive effects. I see lots of people talking about bad, bad things that are going to happen, but I think there's going to be positive effects.</p> <p>And there's going to be more transportation. We're going to be the ones driving. We're going to be the ones that are using the I-70 corridor and all that. I think it's really good that it's going to happen.</p> <p>I don't have much to say, so thank you very much.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	403	Guziur, Mariko	Public	2/26/2005	<p>In order to create the most environmentally sound and long-term oriented progressive solution to this problem for the I-70 corridor, I support tolls, taxes, and the bond issues, or anything else to support an up-front subsidy of getting this project off the ground in order to expedite it as quickly as possible.</p> <p>I think the environment should be of number one importance because it has been shown time and time again the most environmental alternatives are also the most economically sound alternative. And despite the resistance by the special-interest groups and by perhaps Clear Creek County residents or other corporate entities, the most environmentally sound and long-term reaching alternative will provide the best in the long run. And with proper marketing, it can be sold to the general populace.</p> <p>I think that's all.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	412	Guziur, Mariko	Public	2/26/2005	<p>I want to thank you for coming up here today. My name is Mariko Guziur. I'm the librarian at the Fraser Valley Library. I've lived in Colorado my whole life, grew up in -- born in Summit County, grew up in the metro area and have settled here for the past few years. And I think of myself as a pretty well-informed person, especially being a librarian, and I have to say that I didn't even know that the PEIS existed until about three weeks ago when I saw this hearing in the paper.</p> <p>So first of all, I want to thank people from Clear Creek County for coming up here and making such a great showing because I think that you have the most humanistic stake in what's going on. Being a native Coloradan and loving the mountains and making it my home has made me completely invested in this, and from this day forward I will be as vigilant as I can to make sure that rail or the most environmentally sound alternative is implemented.</p> <p>I also -- what was your name?</p> <p>ASTA LOEVLIE: Asta Loevlie.</p> <p>MARKO GUZIUR: I'm married to a European, have been all over Europe, have been on trains. I've also lived in Japan with my mother, who is Japanese, and that is the home to the infamous bullet train. It is more efficient to travel across the length of Japan in six hours than you would do by any other means of transportation, and it's completely not pollutive.</p> <p>And I really think that even though we lead the world in technology -- sorry -- computer technology, we need to be more ahead in transportation technology. That is where the money is. It has been shown time and time again -- and I have a BA in economics -- that the most environmentally sound alternative is always the most economically sound alternative, and I would like to emphasize that in this process.</p> <p>I hope that you reconsider the impassioned pleas from the Clear Creek County residents. And also, I want to light a fire under you Clear Creek County people to tell us more in Grand County about what the impacts would be because I haven't heard anything until today about it's going to affect you or our economy.</p> <p>And maybe I've just been living in a hole, but please, Clear Creek County, speak up to Grand County. Let us know what's been going on, let us know more of the impacts and let us know how -- if CDOT has been biased, let us know how. And if it's impassioned, that's okay because we're impassioned people. So thank you everybody for coming.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	207	Hall, Catherine	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Dear CDOT,</p> <p>I am a homeowner in and around the Lawson area of Colorado. I went to your hearing.</p> <p>I am already severely impacted on the weekends by the inconsiderate drivers on the frontage road - Ct Rd County Road 308.</p> <p>The safety and privacy issues from the traffic as you know are severe. I would like to see a plan to help this situation.</p> <p>Also noise barriers will be necessary for the imposition this project places on my and my family's well being. How about consideration - I am a taxpayer too.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	215	Hallman, Howard	Public	2/23/2005	<p>1. The comment period of your meeting, 6:00 p.m., is scheduled during tonight's Silverthorne Town Council meeting, where the same topic will be discussed. Effectively, many folks will not have the opportunity to make public comment.</p> <p>2. It seems that the decision has already been made by CDOT and the Coalition, and its simply an expensive bandaid approach. A few new lanes at great cost (time, money and delays). By the time the project is completed, it will obsolete. What is needed at a minimum is a longer range more comprehensive plan to include alternative routes and at a minimum, the purchase of a mass transit (rail) right-of-way.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	699	Our Future Summit	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	<p>Dear Cecelia,</p> <p>Attached please find results of a survey conducted in Summit County regarding I-70 expansion by "Our Future Summit."</p> <p>Our Future Summit is a non-partisan, non-profit organization comprised of citizens from the community. We have been discussing I-70 in recent weeks, and we conducted a two-question survey on our web site (<a href="http://www.ourfuturesummit.org">http://www.ourfuturesummit.org</a>) to gauge citizen opinions regarding various expansion alternatives. We are not experts on</p>	Written

this matter but thought that the comments received would be useful for CDOT to see.

The first file contains a pie chart summarizing responses to the multiple-choice question, and it also includes a sample survey on the second page. The second file contains text comments received.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Thank you.

Howard Hallman  
970-468-9134 or 719-491-1807

Categorized Comment	519	Hansen, Mary	Public	5/20/2005	The PEIS study appears to dismiss the devastating economic impact the advised construction would have on Clear Creek County. For a full 15 years major industries (Loveland Basin for one) would suffer considerably, causing havoc to the county tax base. There are fears that Clear Creek would be moved and other massive inconveniences caused in the town of Idaho Springs as well as other towns of the county. There is further objection to the proposal of HOV/HOT lanes which would effectively eliminate Idaho Springs to travelers as well as create problems for residents to bypass traffic jams.	Online
Categorized Comment	159	Harmon, Richard	Public	1/15/2005	Correct. Howdy. I'm also CMC Group with others, but I'm a taxpayer. That's the only dog I am.  But, really, what concerned me was, I'd like to have some more information looked at before we start doing this. I'd like to see if anyone has studied the amount of trapping by exit number at each and every exit all the way up and down at each of the strategic times so we can perhaps separate the great many from the meaningless few. So we can see perhaps if we can only run the very expensive rail, monorail or a traditional rail or bus or whatever, maybe only partway up. But look at it -- and dollars spent at each and every exit all the way up and down I-70. Some very valuable information may be claimed from that.  Two, everybody says that if we're going to build rail we must go with monorail because -- AGS is preferred because of the steepness in grade. Currently, RTD is doing nothing, absolutely nothing about the amount of -- the number of people that live and work and play in Central City-Blackhawk. If you ran a traditional rail system through Central City-Blackhawk instead of down the I-70 corridor, it might make a big difference: it would in at least a bunch of people's lives. Now, I don't live there or work there, but that should be looked at as an alternative also. It's alternatives that haven't been looked at.  Three, if you talk to people across the country that come here to Colorado, we say the words "rail" and "Colorado," monorail's the last thing that comes to mind. They think of the historical rail. They think of all the historic rail here in Colorado, the Rail Museum, Combes Tottec. Perhaps someone should look at a historic traditional alternative to this rail instead when they're looking at something modern. I think live steam would be good.  Thanks.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	420	Harney, Mary	Public	3/26/2005	I think the monorail is a great idea. My boyfriend and I travel to Breckenridge, Colorado a few times a year. I think the monorail would be a great way to get from the Denver airport to the mountains. It looks like fun, too. The proposed highway construction sounds like a nightmare.	Online
Categorized Comment	53	Harp, Kelley	Public	1/18/2005	Public input  I read in the paper today that a lot of people are crying for transit over highway widening. While I will not be able to attend the public hearings on the topic, I want to voice an opinion in favor of widening I-70 over transit.  Transit is fine, but it must be in conjunction with a widening project. The heavy travel to the mountains that necessitates the I-70 improvements are from leisure travelers, presumably for skiing. When people are on vacation -- even if only a day-long getaway -- people want the freedom provided to them by their private vehicles.  Understandably people in Idaho Springs and other potentially affected communities are reluctant to support widening I-70. But more traffic means more visitors for them, which means more money in their town. Further, I don't feel relying on a transit system to relieve congestion will be successful, and it's probably not even practical.  Sincerely, Kelley Harp Colorado native and lifelong resident. harpkw@yahoo.com	Online
Categorized Comment	705	Harper, Brian	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  No response	Written
Categorized Comment	257	Harris, Phil	Public	3/2/2005	I am a retired, building construction executive. My wife and I have lived full time in Summit County for 8 years. We recently attended the I-70 Draft PEIS review held in Silverthorne.  The motivation for this project, apparently, is to protect the growth and profitability of recreational interests, in particular, the ski areas. It seems to me one very important fact has been overlooked. There is not one new ski area or even expansion slated for development. Further, with the current environmental atmosphere there is slim possibility for developing additional skiing acreage. The ski areas are already at maximum capacity (both skiing area and parking) on the weekends. Other recreational activity sites, such as camping and hiking, are also filled.  The current highway provides all the capacity needed to overrun the West Slope with more people than there is infrastructure or recreational area to handle them. So why are we trying to spend \$4 billion to expand a highway that already gets people to just one more full parking lot? The only apparent economic reason for this highway expansion is to make the trip from DIA to the ski areas convenient enough to keep destination skiers from going elsewhere. This is simply the ski corporations wanting tax payers to pay for whatever marketing approach they currently find popular.  At the PEIS review there was much talk of changing the population's thinking and perception in regard to visionary solutions like a monorail or other such nonsense. If CDOT would really like to enter the world of changing the entire outdoor recreation populace, they could do something that would get maximum use of the highway facility we already have, i.e., persuade people to use the highway and recreational areas on weekdays instead of just the weekends. This would probably have a better chance of success than AGS or Rail and it would certainly cost billions less. Another idea that falls in the "visionary solution" category would be to improve the US 285 / 50 corridor from Denver to Grand Junction. This would take some pressure off I-70 plus lend some much needed economic support to an area that really needs it.  Your entire logic for this project, per the PEIS, is that the Denver Metro area will increase population 47% by 2025. Why are mountain communities expected to ameliorate Denver's problem? Actually, if you did nothing it might help Denver's problem, i.e., slow population growth.  Because of the foregoing, please accept two votes for "No Action" or "Minimal Action" at best.  Phil and Jeniel Harris	Online
Categorized Comment	756	Hassinger, Nancy	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  Nancy Hassinger	Written
Categorized Comment	105	Hattan, Dave	Public	2/2/2005	I try to get up into the mountains whenever possible - one of the major benefits of living in Colorado/Denver. I currently avoid I-70 whenever possible - especially weekend afternoons returning to Denver. I haven't gone to a ski area on I-70 for a number of years due to the congestion. Therefore, something needs to be done.	Form

## Comments on Alternatives:

6 lanes of general traffic - This is the basic requirement - to address current congestion and future growth. This is required no matter what else may be done.

HOV lanes - unless HOV is 4 or more, this lane will be congested because families recreating in the mountains are a large part of the demand.

HOT lane - only acceptable if \$ go directly to pay for I-70 improvements.

Transit (bus, rail, etc.) - limited destinations in mountains - acceptable for ski areas (ski companies should help pay) and major town or corridor. Breckenridge would need bus to get to Vail. Transit doesn't get hikers to trail heads or campgrounds, has limited capacity for gear (what about boats, trailers, camping gear?). Utility is limited in summer.

Categorized Comment	203	Hays, Jacob	Public	2/23/2005	I feel that with the current load on I-70 and the chances of closures such as avalanches in the past we should build and alternate roadway and the corridor of highway 285 will give people that don't want to drive crowded I-70 a way around the loop and further development of new ski area's.  sincerely Jacob Hays	Online
Categorized Comment	195	Helmke, Richard	Public	2/17/2005	Very disappointed to hear that the rail option has been dismissed as being "too expensive to sell." Think that is very shortsighted.  As a frequent traveller of I70 from the Western slope to Denver, I think the disruptions, safety issues, and lost revenues inherent in a 15 year project to widen the highway far outweigh the extra initial cost.  This decision must be made for the long term and with the vision of the end product. A rail solution would be a tourist attraction. It would be nondisruptive to build and it better answers the very valid safety concerns. We see accidents, some fatal, closing Glenwood canyon nearly every week. Additionally, widening the highway to 6 lanes in the very heart of the Rockies will diminish the scenic beauty that brings the visitors to in the first place; rather a "killing the golden goose approach."  I urge you to reconsider a rail approach.	Online
Categorized Comment	471	Helseth, Pete	Public	5/1/2005	This comment concerns the impact that the highway already has on Clear Creek. I-70 and this river are never far apart through Clear Creek County. Others have addressed the strain that sand and chemical de-icers place on the health of this waterway when they're washed into it from the highway. But there are other impacts that I don't think have received as much attention. In considering implementation of a river cleanup day, I asked the owner of a local rafting company what sort of trash his company encounters on their daily trips from approximately Lawson downstream to Idaho Springs or even to Kermitt's: "Yes, there is a lot of un-natural debris in Clear Creek, old bridge pillars, chunks of concrete & asphalt, culverts, rebar, pipes of which most are not going anywhere without mechanical advantage. Then there is the slue of orange highway debris from construction closures and maintenance along with the "normal" trash (garbage, tires, pieces of cars, glass, ect.) you would see along any highway all of which is in and on the banks of Clear Creek." (Source: John Rice, Clear Creek Rafting Company, Idaho Springs CO) This information makes it clear that there is much work to be done to return this river to something closer to a natural condition even now. And if CDOT has allowed such debris to rather routinely wind up in the river, what can we expect with 15 full years of construction to widen the highway even more beside the creek's banks? I suggest that the Department: 1) implements a river monitoring program to stop the degradation of Clear Creek that is already taking place; 2) ensure that whatever future construction is done on the highway abides by the terms of this program to keep the debris situation from getting worse; and 3) that CDOT proactively facilitates a River Cleanup Day for Clear Creek, since much of the river flows within I-70's Right-of-Way and at present it is problematic for concerned friends of the river to even correct the problem that already exists. Once steps like these are taken, along with other pollution-control measures to counteract runoff of chemicals and sand from the road surface to the waterway, Clear Creek might once again live up to its name, and it might once again be a feature to be proud of rather than a casualty of the lifestyle of our society. The ecosystem would benefit, as would recreationists like fishermen and boaters. And boating could be further enhanced by making the box culverts near Empire Junction navigable to commercial rafts in any future highway configuration or alternative.  Pete Helseth Evergreen	Online
Categorized Comment	380	Henceroth, Alan	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/23/2005	Hi. My name is Alan Henceroth, and I'm representing Arapahoe Basin Ski Area today.  Frequently on Saturdays and Sundays I go out of my way to meet with all our guests that visit the ski area. It's really common for them to tell me it took them two, three, four hours to get to the ski area from Denver. We think the need to do something is now. It's already now. It's not something in the future. And then when we look at those numbers to what we expect transportation demands to be in 25 years, it's only going to grow dramatically.  We really support CDOT in one of the combination alternatives where we build a six-lane highway now. And we really share the passion for mass transit that several other people have shown today and when hopefully that becomes financially more feasible and the technology gets to where we need to be to do that. So we support the combination of six lanes while preserving for mass transit.  Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	460	Salem Minerals Inc.	Associations & Special Interest Groups	4/20/2005	Salem Minerals Inc. P. O. Drawer 1 645 Water St. Silver Plume, CO 80476 Tel. 303-569-0155 Fax 303-569-0156  Cecilia Joy, Project Manager CDOT, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011  Jean Wallace, Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue, Suite 180 Lakewood, CO 80228  April 20, 2005  Re: I-70 Draft PEIS Comments  Gentlemen:  Please be advised that we own the historic Buckley Bros. Store Building in Silver Plume, Colorado. We comment as follows:  1. CDOT has failed to include our property in the historical survey of the I-70 corridor. We are eligible to be listed on the National Historic Register as a stand alone building (and such listing is being pursued), and we are in the Georgetown-Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District with a building greater than 50 years old. CDOT's failure to include us in the inventory of historic structures illustrates both the failure and weakness of the inventory effort, as well as the significance of the threat to our historic structure by the proposed moving of the westbound Silver Plume exit and the site plans showing the placement of a scenic overlook 26 feet in front of our building.  All of the sketches of the Silver Plume interchange show the westbound exit removed. We have also seen a sketch showing the scenic overlook directly in front of our store, which would cut off vehicular access to the front of our building, and leave us facing an earth bank far in excess of the height of our building. The net effect of either one of these proposed changes would be to destroy the economic viability of our building causing its eventual loss through abandonment.  2. CDOT has put forth the figure that no historic properties will be affected in Silver Plume through any of the alternatives. This is utterly false. By moving the westbound exit from the historic entrance to Silver Plume, CDOT will destroy the economic viability of the Silver Plume terminus of the Georgetown Loop Railroad as well as the economic viability of the businesses in historic structures on Main St. as well as the viability of the Buckley Bros. Store, all through depriving these businesses of the 90% of their traffic that has entered Silver Plume at Woodward Avenue and Water St since 1930. This is the current site of the westbound Exit 226, which is why the exit was sited there in the 1960s. If the exit is moved, these businesses and attractions will be mostly forced to close and the historic buildings will fall into disrepair or ruin.	Written

3. CDOT has not taken into account the very low per capita income of Silver Plume. CDOT has taken Clear Creek County as a whole for calculating per capita income/residents below poverty line and this incorporates a very high income area in the eastern part of Clear Creek County. For purposes of calculating low income areas to meet Federal statute, we believe that Silver Plume as a separate municipality should be treated as such.

4. We question the noise gradient presented in the draft PEIS. At our location at 645 Water St, the noise level frequently exceeds the levels shown in the draft PEIS, especially when heavy truck traffic excessively uses un-muffled jake brakes or overrevs on the uphill pull. The noise level has been known to hurt the ears of our employees working outside.

5. By moving the westbound exit at Silver Plume further west, CDOT will cause the significant amount of traffic that accesses the Georgetown Loop Railroad at the westbound exit (approximately 90% of their Silver Plume ridership) to travel a long distance through residential areas of Silver Plume to reach the attraction. As Water St. is currently projected to be shut off by the scenic overlook, the visitors would have to exit somewhere west, and either go most of the length of Main St. to Woodward Avenue and then down Woodward to the current exit location, or they would travel partly on Water St. to Garland St. thence to Main St. and thence to Woodward Avenue and thence to the attraction. This incredibly increases the traffic through residential areas of Silver Plume, especially on Main St. from the west end of Silver Plume to Woodward Avenue. In the absence of town law enforcement, the speed limit of 10 mph will frequently be broken, and young children along the route will be at risk. The same comments apply for visitors trying to access the businesses in historic structures on the far eastern portion of Main St.—instead of traveling one block down Woodward Avenue from the exit, they will be forced into a far lengthier, circuitous path through neighborhoods of Silver Plume that do not experience through traffic now. Re-routing the traffic flow to the west will also cause visitors to get lost, go into other neighborhoods, and the overall number of visitors to the businesses and attractions will fall due to removal of the easy access, causing the businesses to fail economically.

6. Moving the westbound exit will dramatically increase response time for emergency services to the majority of Silver Plume residences. All emergency services currently use the westbound exit for access to Silver Plume. The current exit is in the geographic center of Silver Plume, which is why it has been the access point to Silver Plume since 1930. By moving the westbound exit ramp further west, this increases the likelihood of major accidents that block I-70 for hours occurring in the new additional distance before the exit, thereby completely blocking emergency vehicle access to Silver Plume. The bicycle path is projected to be removed, which was the only other possible access for when I-70 is blocked. Semi tractor-trailer wrecks that block all lanes and the shoulders of I-70 in one direction already occur between Georgetown and Silver Plume. By moving the westbound exit further west, CDOT will greatly increase the distance that can be blocked in these accidents. Also, CDOT is increasing the possibility of westbound I-70 being blocked by these accidents for all traffic. At least now, vehicles can bypass an accident by taking the westbound Silver Plume exit and then the frontage road.

CDOT is also going to dramatically increase emergency vehicle response time to the majority of Silver Plume residences by moving the westbound exit. Barring any road closure, ambulances, fire and sheriff vehicles may take up to 10 minutes longer to reach certain residences in Silver Plume (such as those on Mountain St.) by having to travel a long distance through residential streets to reach the geographic center of town, which is where the exit is now. This increases the risk of children being run over, as well as the noise disturbance from sirens.

7. It has been presented in meetings that "there is not enough room for the exit to remain." We have done a careful analysis of the CDOT right of way corridor at the site, and there is enough room to keep the exit under all alternatives, especially if urban style retaining walls are used on one side or even two sides of the exit. We are qualified to make this analysis, as we do construct roads and bridges as part of our business activities.

For Salem Minerals Inc.,  
Todd C. Hennis Pres.

Categorized Comment	578	Hestekin, Patricia	Public	5/24/2005	May 23, 2005	Online
					Please consider this request for a noise impact study and proactive action (sound walls) for the area west of Silver Plume to Herman's Gulch in Clear Creek County.	
					As a resident of the former town site of Graymont, I have used a RadioShack model 33-4050 Sound Level meter to record traffic noise during the early part of May. Despite being after the ski season and before the summer tourism season, decibel readings ranged between 62 and 72 on a regular basis. Nearing midnight, semi-trailer truck tires held the meter's needle at a steady 75 outside my bedroom window.	
					Angela Stearns of the Upper Clear Creek Homeowners Association has submitted a chart of the actual data obtained between Silver Plume and Herman's Gulch. To repeat Angela's request, a sound barrier should be constructed in our area even if no alterations to I-70 are undertaken.	
					Although expansion of I-70 to six lanes in Clear Creek County will provide the general public with the appearance that action is being taken, ultimately it will do little to change the commute for front-range skiers, campers and other recreation seekers. I agree with the I-70 Coalition in requesting that CDOT redevelop/reconstruct the "pinch points" in the I-70 corridor.	
					Should you choose not to heed the requests of Clear Creek County, the I-70 Coalition, the Upper Clear Creek Homeowners Association and myself not to expand I-70 to six lanes, then I would request such expansion take place to the north of the existing footprint between Silver Plume and the Bakerville exit.	
					My final request is that CDOT work directly with the Clear Creek County Greenway Committee in development of their Greenway Plan when making any alterations to I-70 in our County.	
					Patti Hestekin	
Categorized Comment	419	Hetherington, Katie	Public	2/26/2005	Hi. My name is Katie. And I've been here and I haven't really heard about this either since like today and everything. But sitting here listening to the people who have been talking and everything, it's kind of like, wow, because I didn't realize what kind of an impact that it could have. But the way -- thinking about it, like the way I see it if we do have the six-lane highways and everything, we are going to be the ones driving and everything. And it may impact Colorado a lot, but the more cars and the more pollution and everything is also going to impact the animals and environmental too.	Transcripts
					So -- also I think that how Clear Creek County was talking about how big of an impact it was going to have on them, like, I had no knowledge of that, and so I don't think that the six-lane highway would be very helpful. And also, being that me and my peers and the people my age are going to be the ones paying for this, it's like we don't want to be -- like, we're going to be impacted by it a lot, you know. So, thank you.	
Categorized Comment	566	Heyse, Don	Public	5/23/2005	Impending "Peak Oil" foreshadows the decline of the automobile. A fixed guideway rail transit system is the only viable option for the I-70 Mountain Corridor.	Online
					It is generally recognized throughout the petroleum industry that global oil production is approaching a peak, after which it will begin a steady decline. This is the "peak oil" phenomenon. Global oil demand, however, will continue to increase, keeping pace with growth. Global oil production will fail to meet demand in the coming years, and this will drive prices steeply upward.	
					Exponentially rising fuel prices will force motorists to radically restrict their driving, and seek other modes of transportation. A Fixed Guideway Transit System, using a rail technology, or the Train Alternative, are that only alternatives that will adequately address the "peak oil" crisis. Six lanes of pavement will be of little use when no one can afford to drive on them.	
Categorized Comment	616	Heyse, Don	Public	5/24/2005	The construction and operation of a six-lane highway will have an enormous and unacceptably destructive impact upon the Town of Silver Plume, as well as upon the entire Georgetown-Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District. All of the mountain communities in the path of the highway will experience similar destructive effects. Building a six-lane highway through these communities is unconscionable.	Online
					The transit alternatives with the least impact upon these historic communities are Rail with IMC (InterMountain Connection) and AGS (Advanced Guideway System) monorail, with NO additional highway lanes. AGS construction would inflict the least construction damage upon the communities, and is the most preferable alternative. AGS monorail should be given serious consideration.	
Categorized Comment	617	Heyse, Don	Public	5/24/2005	Look at the photo illustration of the AGS monorail passing through Silver Plume (Chapter 2.2, page 34). This is the transportation of the future. Wake up and smell the coffee! We don't want to find ourselves in the middle of the 21st century saddled with the archaic multi-lane highways of the past. Let's build the future now!	Online
					This AGS monorail, traveling over the existing highway, clearly has the least impact upon both the Town	

of Silver Plume and the surrounding environment. Plus, it is fast, attractive, energy efficient, and quiet.

Categorized Comment	619	Heyse, Don	Public	5/25/2005	Environmental criteria must be emphasized in the final screening and analysis, not capital cost. Full environmental costs must be evaluated. The Final PEIS should not be issued until the public has a chance to review the reactions and further study concerns regarding the inadequacy of environmental findings.	Online
Categorized Comment	621	Heyse, Don	Public	5/25/2005	Capital costs are not the only costs to be considered. Operational costs and environmental costs must also be considered. As we enter the era of "Peak Oil", fuel prices will rise dramatically, and the cost of driving an automobile will be prohibitive for many. The AGS has a higher capital cost. However, the net cost to the taxpayer includes both the capital cost and the operational cost. When petroleum prices are sky-high, the AGS will be the alternative with the lowest net cost to the taxpayer.	Online
Categorized Comment	622	Heyse, Don	Public	5/25/2005	Where is the vision of what the mountains will be for future generations? What is the quality of life that attracts people to the mountains? How much mountain sprawl do we want? How much pavement do we want? How many parking lots do we want? Are we in danger of destroying our mountain natural resources? These issues need to be resolved before any irreversible highway construction is approved, and these cannot be deferred to Tier II studies.	Online
Categorized Comment	624	Heyse, Don	Public	5/25/2005	In summary, I advocate: 1. A Fixed Guideway Transit System, using a rail technology and not a bus fixed guideway. 2. Make NO six-lane highway improvements. Make only selected highway improvements. 3. Utilize Enhanced Bus Operations to supplement the Fixed Guideway Transit System with Intermodal Transfer Centers 4. Implement Travel Demand Management and Travel System Management 5. Develop Enhanced Air Service 6. For the AGS, consider Alternate Routes outside of the Highway Right-of-way as appropriate.	Online
Categorized Comment	253	Hicks, John	Public	2/28/2005	I want to start by thanking all you highway people for helping me get around. They work great! This is the 6th winter I've lived NW of Idaho Springs. I commute to Denver week in and week out - all year long. I-70 works great.  When I get to Denver, the highways are all hosed up, congested and working against one another. Please place your resources/vision/energy for upgrade in Denver where things don't work.  If you start tearing up I-70 West, you will create congestion and delays that will make the commute impossible for me. I am a minister and must be able to time my commute. I'll have to move out of the mountains. I don't want this. I-70 works. Please don't mess with it. Leave it alone.  Thanks for asking for my opinion.  John	Form
Categorized Comment	262	Hill, Jeri	Public	2/2/2005	Hello. I'm just concerned that the mass-transit alternatives were kind of eliminated early, especially the monorail and AGS alternatives, with the idea of the cost being central as opposed to what would really be good for the entire community.  I'm very concerned about getting more lanes on that particular highway, because we have a property which is already extremely noisy and unbearable and it's going to become even more unbearable to the point where we would probably have to move or get some kind of expensive walls put in to address that. It would seem much more feasible in the long run for the people who actually inhabit the corridor to have the -- some kind of mass-transit solution.  And I do understand the gentleman's concerns about the cost and about the monorail being monolithic in that it wouldn't really provide a lot of alternatives; that it would be the only alternative. But it certainly seems to me that in our light-rail experiments on the I-25 corridor that we've had a lot of success, and the people have used it and used it well.  So I'm sad that it would be taken out of the -- off the table altogether; that at least we keep it there for future consideration to see if we can work with the concept and make that concept realistic.  Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	735	Hillman, John	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  To make public transportation work, incentives have to be right. Driving a car needs to be expensive, and the public transportation needs to be cheap. I would favor gradually increasing gasoline taxes right now. Those who must use the highway and not the train (such as trucks, busses, cars for the handicapped, etc.) would get a rebate on the excess gas tax. The extra gas taxes would pay for development of wonderful public transportation. A toll system on the highway would be another way to pay for the train and discourage use of the highway, but such a system would have to be automatic. I can't see toll booths further slowing traffic. The E-470 ExpressToll works well; but that won't work for occasional visitors; and we don't want to discourage occasional visitors.	Written
Categorized Comment	38	Hills, George	Public	1/13/2005	I have been driving the I-70 corridor as a salesman, a part time Vail resident and a vacationer for about thirty seven years. I have seen my share of traffic problems in that time frame. In my opinion, you could widen I-70 to eight lanes in each direction from Denver to Glenwood Springs, plus drill additional tunnels for every lane, and you would not solve the problem of traffic congestion on that piece of roadway. Not now - Not ever! That is because with the I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement [PEIS], the primary cause of the difficulty on that roadway has not been addressed.  Simply put, the fundamental problem behind the weekend congestion is the driving skill level variations of the multiple vehicle type operators who use I-70. There are some drivers who are competent in every respect and who can adapt to various driving conditions no matter what day of the week or what time of day, or what type of vehicle involved. But there are others who are so incompetent that the smallest fluctuation in the weather [like a snowflake hitting their windshield, a curve in the roadway [however minor in degree of turn], a tunnel [something to honk their horns inside of], or an accident of any magnitude [from a fender bender to a multivehicle disaster] causes these unskilled drivers to panic and slow down. All it takes is one tired Flatlander, an inexperienced teenager, a hyped-up speeder, an exhausted trucker, or a drunk driver and you have the recipe for congestion all set to explode. Combine any of the preceding conditions with volume like on a Sunday afternoon, and the equation for disaster is set to go. Just like there is now on virtually every Sunday afternoon of the year!  And to resolve this congestion, it is proposed to spend billions of dollars over ten years to pave over the I-70 Corridor. Amazing! I guess it will create jobs for a while. But in the end in 2015, will anything be solved. NO WAY!  What would be a better solution [since there will never be a way to keep the unskilled driver off I-70] would be to: 1) straighten out with tunnels the factors [multiple curves] that contribute to the major existing bottlenecks three miles on either side of Idaho Springs [Mile marker 238 to 244 ], AND 2) create Several Rapid Response Accident Teams similar to that seen inside the Eisenhower - Johnson Tunnel. These would be positioned in several locations historically known for serious accidents at times of maximum anticipated traffic loads on the Interstate. Accidents can be investigated, injured flown to Denver Trauma Centers and vehicles removed in a fraction of the time it now takes. Witness, for example, the tragic accident at Mile Marker 218 just before Christmas this year that closed the Interstate for five hours. Terrific emergency response, but totally unacceptable in terms of how long the road was closed!  Cost of this specific program: about a quarter of what the ten year project has been forecasted. AND it would all be in operation within about two years.  How about it?!	Online
Categorized Comment	515	Hivner, Michael	Public	5/18/2005	As a dedicated hiker to the Herman Gulch trail system, I feel that the pristine wilderness area is worthy of consideration and eventually the sanctioned protection by both State and Federal authorities. While the growth in our state has forced expansion plans, it is important to consider the reason why the expansion is necessary. The natural Colorado ecosystem must be considered in the plans. In the Herman Gulch area it is important to expand on the south side of the I-70 corridor and do everything possible to reduce the impact to the Herman Gulch area. This would include speed limits, sound	Online

barriers and other measures to reduce the impact. This area is a haven for Front Range urbanites to escape and enjoy the proximity of Colorado's largest tourism attraction, the Rocky Mountains. Not to mention the importance of the ability to attract out of state and international tourists.

Categorized Comment	378	Hocevar, Michael	Public	2/23/2005	Hello. My name is Michael Hocevar. I currently reside in Georgetown. I've been around the area for -- and I've lived within the Clear Creek County area for quite some time.  (Problem with microphone.)  Okay, I'm Michael Hocevar. I live in Georgetown, and I've lived in the Clear Creek County area for a long time. I've also worked all along the I-70 corridor. I've been a professional driver driving up and down the corridor. I've worked in Summit County. I've worked in Clear Creek County and Gilpin counties.  I've worked on highway construction including rock scaling. And I've also done traffic control work for those things, including two different projects up on Berthoud Pass. And I also have a background in economics. I feel like I just needed to get it out so you know where I'm coming from.  The reason why I came here is I've noticed that you've got two areas on 70 that are going to require a tremendous amount of rock scaling and such; the Silver Plume Hill section and the Hidden Valley section. And I know that there's really no way to do that kind of work without tremendous impacts on traffic. For example, I've heard up on the pass we were only supposed to stop traffic for 20 minutes at a time. That was by -- like by law and by permit.  Heck, I was routinely stopping people for 45 minutes or an hour. You know, it was like making a new friend for an hour -- you know, sitting there talking with them and all that. It's just going to be disastrous attempting to widen I-70. Whatever you do, it's going to be a problem. It's going to be a problem for engineering. It's going to be a headache for the superintendents and everyone at CDOT. You know, it's going to be a headache for legislature.  I really have a hard time seeing how widening 70 is going to work, particularly for the projections of the population increasing, traffic increasing. Whereas it has been pointed out that, by the time we're done, we might have so much traffic it's still not going to be enough.  Mass transportation does have some advantages, but it's also expensive. And it is pretty much going to take airport passengers -- most of the vehicles, I think, as has been pointed out, are people who live along the Front Range. So, therefore, the train would help, but only to a certain extent.  So I put some thought into this, and the only thing I could think of that would really take pressure off I-70 would be if you had a second highway going -- like has been talked about -- going underneath Boreas Pass. You could put four lanes there so you have -- four new lanes, rather, and two new lanes that would take a lot of pressure off of 70. Most of the construction would be virgin territory, so I-70 can pretty much keep on doing its normal business. Businesses up here in Summit County can pretty much continue on without too much effect.  And, you know, with the growing population, that's the only thing I can think of that's really going to make an impact. And I would also like to say again this is probably the least amount of headache if you work for CDOT or the engineer or anything like that. So please give that some new consideration.  Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	435	Hocevar, Michael	Public	4/11/2005	April 11, 2005  P.O. Box 364 Georgetown, CO 80444 (303) 569-0198 Xaxon47@yahoo  Cecelia Joy, Project Manager CDOT, Region 1 could be FR 120 anwww.i70mncorridor.com  Dear Ms. Joy:  This letter is a follow through on my correspondence of March 5.  Although I stated a Boreas pathway before, Whale Peak is the straightest way. A good starting point is 285, coming out by Tiger Run Road. I see two possible options from here. One to follow hwy 9, or to tunnel underneath Ten Mile Peak and connect with 70 at Copper Mt. The latter route would be very efficient and not pass through Frisco. One would have eight lanes of route total, four on this route and four on 70. I believe this would carry a very large amount of traffic, especially compared to six lanes on 70.  Another option may be a monorail from C-470 - 285 junction following the Whale Peak route.  Please give this some serious consideration.  Sincerely,  Michael Hocevar	Online
Categorized Comment	214	Hocevar, Michael	Public	2/23/2005	With traffic expected to increase to the point where a few years after widening 70, we could have the problems again and Silver Plume Hill and Hidden Valley will be extremely difficult to work while traffic is present; I have concluded an alternative road is needed. A tunnel under Boreas Pass or Hoosier Pass could provide this. This would solve a lot of the problems with widening to 70 including business in Summit County from being effected too much.	Form
Categorized Comment	279	Hocevar, Michael	Public	3/5/2005	March 5, 2005  P.O. Box 364 Georgetown, CO 80444 (303) 569-0198 Xaxon47@yahoo  Cecelia Joy, Project Manager CDOT, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Ave Aurora, CO 80011 (303) 757-9112  Dear Ms. Joy:  I believe there are many advantages to a tunnel underneath Boreas Pass. This would provide a second viable route for automobile traffic. In the event 70 is closed and to take a big chunk of the traffic from 70. With 4 lanes this could handle as much traffic as 70.  This road would be a virgin cut, allowing most of the construction to take place with no impact on current traffic. This would help the ski resorts and all business along 70 during construction.  This route would provide a back door to Breckenridge. A nice convenience for all who live in or visit the town.  The engineering, logistics of construction, especially traffic control, build time and public relations should be minimal since the current route has minimal impact.  I have worked on numerous stabilization projects, both as a crew worker and as a flagger. It seems obvious Hidden Valley and Silver Plume Hill would be horrendous to work on while traffic is live. The backups are certain to be so long it will take forever to clear traffic out. Ms. Joy, as Project Manager will you have to spend fifteen years answering to the complaints?  A Boreas Pass route could be built concurrently, with widening highway 9.  Ms. Joy please give this serious consideration.  Michael Hocevar	Online

Categorized Comment	307	Hodge, Robby	Municipalities	2/9/2005	<p>Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am Robby Hodge. I'm a selectman for the Town of Georgetown. And Chuck said everything that highlighted our official letter.</p> <p>I think the most important thing that's been brought up tonight is that vision idea of what are we going to do. I'm going to be here in 50 years, and I've been here for 20 years already. Highways are a great thing. Highways are a stream of life, stream of commerce, and it's an important part of our community for all of the reasons that it is here.</p> <p>And these poor guys have a tough job trying to satisfy everybody. And we need to help them figure out a way to accommodate what's going to work best for everybody. They don't have enough money. Nobody has enough money to do what they need to do. So how are we going to do that? How are we actually going to create an economy that's sustainable and, you know, give everybody a chance to do the best they possibly can do?</p> <p>The highway's worked just fine up to this point, but we need something that's going to take us into the future. And I think our best bet is an elevated guideway system, some kind of mass transit. All the alternatives that people have talked about using 285. I don't think anybody's mentioned there was a study a while back that I remember was about using the existing railway that comes through Winter Park. It was a great one too, and I thought that was a very cost effective method of getting that mass transit in place right now and taking that pressure off of the -- whatever construction has to happen here. But the fact is that the Front Range is so full of people that there's not going to be enough volume of access anywhere to handle all the people that are coming here, because everybody in the world wants to come here for the same reasons we're here.</p> <p>Gentlemen, you have a tough job, and I wish you the best of luck. And we need to get behind these guys [INAUDIBLE DUE TO COUGHING]. They're right, you know, they're the messengers; they're not the end of the line. They're our public servants and we need to tax ourselves enough to pay for all of this, and that's a tough thing to do.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	584	Hoekstra, Ricki	Public	2/16/2005	<p>I attended the meeting at the Jefferson County fairgrounds. As you might remember, not one person was in favor of the draft. There are too many issues not addressed. What the water situation will be in 25 years, no one knows. The pollution created by digging up soil can be immense. The taking of land and of historical sites along I-70 was not adequately discussed. The displays were very impressive, but in such detail that it was hard to get a comprehensive idea.</p> <p>I would like to ask you:</p> <p>Be daring, be brave, be innovative. Do not go back to the old standby of building more lanes; that solution will be obsolete by the time it is finished.</p> <p>Build a monorail or a guided bus system. It CAN be done as it has been in Europe. The whole nation will use your idea as an example and will look up to you for your creative solutions. Let a private company take over that part of railway or bus.</p> <p>Also, please leave the part of exit 259 to Chief Hosa alone. There are no major problems and a 25 ft wall and a climbing lane will create huge bottlenecks later, with the tunnel.</p> <p>In case you do not agree with this, I ask you to please wait till last to build this. A huge wall will deface the "Gateway to the Rockies." I live off exit 254 and I never have seen a huge traffic jam, unless there is an accident.</p> <p>I do hope sincerely that you will reconsider your plans. I thank you for serving on the Board and the time you spent on it.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ricki Hoekstra</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	348	Holcomb, Patricia	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/16/2005	<p>Hi. I'm Patricia Holcomb. I'm the director and technical advisor of the Endangered Places Program for Colorado Preservation Incorporated.</p> <p>One of the main products of the Endangered Places Program is the annual Colorado most endangered places list. And in 2005, the historic communities along I-70 and in Clear Creek expansion corridor were named to the list. The process that we use to determine this list site is not just Colorado Preservation that determines them; we have -- the general public nominates a site. In this case this site was nominated by more people than I've ever seen nominated a site. The list is pages long. The supporters of this nomination, six stacks of letters in support of this nomination.</p> <p>I won't go into detail because I know I don't have a lot of time, but there's a review process that's quite extensive that we go through to determine which sites will make the list. It really boils down to what is most historically significant and what is most endangered. This site was nominated, I think, due to the nominators' concerns. First and foremost, they're in fear of losing communities that have worked for generations. Their efforts to create tourism will be adversely affected. They want any road or transit plan to enhance, not detract from, their community aesthetics. They want every alternative to be considered toward this end.</p> <p>And, in addition to the preservation of significant and historic buildings, they want solutions that will not increase their water and noise pollution. They fear solutions that will affect their local economies, which are currently largely based on heritage tourism. They fear they'll have a wider road with fewer things for travelers to see and do as they drive along.</p> <p>We have contacted CDOT when this place was a finalist for our list, and they said that they feel that in Tier II they'll address the historic aspects of -- I know they've already identified historic sites. I just want to say that in the past several years we've had a lot of sites that are nominated for the list that -- that have not necessarily made it, but sometimes you get so far along in a process that you can't go back. And I've actually seen CDOT bend over backwards to make sure that things work out, and we can catch them in the right stage.</p> <p>And this is why I think the board of directors of CPI -- and we have over 50 reviewers that say we are all professionals who believe that the time is right for this site to be on the list. We need to start thinking about these things now.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	819	Colorado Preservation, Inc.	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/13/2005	<p>Colorado Preservation, Inc. 1900 Wazee Street, Suite 360 Denver, CO 80202 Phone 303.893.4260 Fax 303.893.4333</p> <p>May 13, 2005</p> <p>Mr. David Nicol Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration Colorado Field Office 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80226</p> <p>Dear Mr. Nicol:</p> <p>As a consulting party to the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS, Colorado Preservation, Inc. submits the following comment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Area of Potential Effect. The APE should encompass the viewshed, with consideration given to direct and indirect impacts to historic and natural resources, as well as to wildlife. A 500 foot APE would not fully address adverse effects such as emissions, dust, noise, and vibration.</li> <li>2. Reconnaissance Survey. More detailed surveys should be conducted with regard to historic resources along I-70 in Clear Creek County. In addition to buildings, these surveys should include mining resources as well as physical historic settings, including landscapes and viewsheds.</li> <li>3. Assessment of Effects/Comparison of Alternatives. The preferred alternatives in this draft lean toward short-term economic affordability but away from long-term protection of natural and historic resources, as well as community values and the environment. Our view is that minimal-action components (transportation management, interchange modifications, auxiliary lanes, etc.) should be instituted as soon as possible. For the long-term, additional funds should be secured (e.g., bonds, federal sources, etc.) to enable consideration of alternatives (e.g., combination highway/transit) more evenly sensitive to all potential effects, as well as to potential ability to accommodate traffic growth beyond the period of Study (e.g., mass transit). For example, wouldn't overall cost be reduced if we only had to conduct one transit improvement project over the next 50 years, instead of two or more?</li> <li>4. Mitigation. Adverse effects of the current project, as well as those resulting from original construction of I-70, with particular regard to the Idaho Springs National Historic District, should be taken into account when considering mitigation.</li> </ol> <p>Sincerely,</p>	Written



					<p>Patricia Holcomb Director, Technical Advisor Endangered Places Program</p> <p>cc: U.S. Senator Wayne Allard U.S. Senator Ken Salazar U.S. Representative Mark Udall Colorado Senate President Joan Fitz-Gerald Colorado Representative Tom Plant Georgianna Contiguglia, State Historic Preservation Officer Dan Corson, Amy Pallante, State Office of Historic Preservation Carol Legard, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation Ann Pritzlaff, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation James Lindberg, National Trust for Historic Preservation Cecelia Joy, CDOT, Project Manager Mary Ann Naber, FHWA, Federal Preservation Officer</p>	
Categorized Comment	773	Hollar, Todd	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Todd Hollar todd_hollar@knowledgegemessenger.com 1342 S. Humboldt Denver, CO 80210</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	458	Holmes, Ted	Public	3/21/2005	<p>March 21, 2005</p> <p>Mr. Jeff Kallman Colorado Department of Highways 18500 E. Colfax Ave. Aurora, CO. 80011</p> <p>Re: I-70 Clear Creek County</p> <p>Dear Mr. Kallman,</p> <p>As a 60 year resident of Colorado and 25 years in Clear Creek, I feel it is time that I express my disdain for the planning of a future I-70. The Clear Creek corridor is being considered by CDOT as being expendable for the exploitation of Summit and Eagle counties. I remember my early days skiing and the need to drive through Idaho Springs and Georgetown. I also recall the agonizing detours and long wait as the construction was carried out for years.</p> <p>I travel I-70 many times during the year and I have found that on but a few occasions I am delayed more than 10 or 15 minutes form Silver Plume to Denver. As I have traveled the corridor on weekends I have noticed several bottlenecks. The Twin Tunnels, Dumont Junction, Empire Junction and most of all slow moving trucks. I consider the truck traffic as being the major culprit impeding traffic, a truck reduces the highway to one lane and backs up traffic for miles behind as the autos move into line to pass a truck. Truckers often try to pass one and other on steep grades further impeding the flow of traffic. If trucks were not allowed between 6:00 AM and 9:00 AM on weekend mornings west bound and 3:00 PM — 6:00 PM east bound in the evening I am certain traffic would flow with fewer slow downs.</p> <p>The money for the I-70 project is none existent and the Highway department continues the planning process. Why is there such a focus on a wider I-70 when there are other highways to Summit and Eagle counties, the department should exploit the other options?</p> <p>The money that would be spent on I-70 could be used for additional Highway Patrol to enforce the laws on passing and speeding, this would go along way towards making I-70 efficient without decimating Clear Creek County.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ted Holmes P.O. Box 951 Silver Plume, CO</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	762	Holt, Raylene	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>No action (but continue \$532 million in already planned improvements)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	329	Houpt, Tresi	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/12/2005	<p>Thank you. As you can see, there are numerous discussions that are centered around this PEIS. And I think everyone who's here to learn more about it and to share views.</p> <p>I'm a -- I'm the chair of the I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition. We're comprised of 29 municipalities and counties. And we're in the process of analyzing the PEIS through a technology committee that we have put together. We'll be going on a road trip very soon to all of the member communities. There will be two presentations in Glenwood Springs, one for the county on February 22nd, the other for the city on March 3rd at 5 p.m. And I'm sorry I don't have the time for the county presentation. It will be on our agenda, and we'll get that out. We'll have a very condensed analysis of the PEIS to share on that day, and we'll ask people for input from the various communities.</p> <p>After we collect feedback from all of our member communities, we're going to come together and bring all of that information together, learn from each other, share all of the information collectively, and create through a process of consensus, a preferred alternative.</p> <p>We don't know what that's going to look like at this point. As you can well imagine, because of the length of the corridor, each of our members have different concerns and issues and levels of impact. And so I think it's very important that we come together with the notion of listening to understand and being well aware of the impacts that occur along the length of the entire corridor.</p> <p>CDOT has been great in working with us. So we really do appreciate the recognition of the corridor coalition, the additional time that you've given us to review and analyze the PEIS. And we certainly look forward to continued discussion on this well into the future.</p> <p>So if you are interested in coming to additional meetings, there will be two more in this area. And there will be meetings for the next couple of months throughout the mountain corridor area.</p> <p>I also want to thank Jack Taylor, Senator Jack Taylor, for being here today. It means a great deal to see you in the audience. We appreciate your interest and concern. So thank you.</p> <p>If you have any questions about the coalition, there obviously are numerous people who can answer those questions. But you are more than welcome to give me a call at my office as well.</p> <p>MICHELLE LI: Excuse me, Commissioner, is there a website that may list these meetings or anything that you have?</p> <p>TRESI HOUPT: I'll have to check, it may be on the Northwest Cog Rail Resort Website. But they are still being finalized. The dates and times are -- as you can imagine, we have a very short time frame, and we're trying to fit 29 meetings into that, as well as time to then analyze the outcome of each of those meetings and prepare for a retreat for the membership to come together and duke out the final product.</p> <p>MICHELLE LI: We can certainly appreciate it.</p> <p>TRESI HOUPT: We will actually ask our newspapers to carry schedules too so that people are aware of that. And we'll submit those to them and see if they'd be willing to cover that. Thanks.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	588	Howell, Jan	Public	5/24/2005	<p>As a resident of Clear Creek County, I have followed very closely the efforts that have been made by the Mountain Corridor Coalition. This has been a remarkable effort made by many individuals, counties and municipalities. Through days of negotiations they have come up with the Regionally Preferred Alternative. I strongly encourage CDOT to accept their recommendations. I have followed this process very closely and do not agree with all of the proposals, but accept the fact that it closely reflects the needs and limitations of the participant's communities. I sincerely hope that CDOT will do the same.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. Jan J.Howell</p>	Online

Categorized Comment	573	Howell, John	Public	5/23/2005	<p>I grew up in Clear Creek County, spending the majority of my life in Idaho Springs. Many of the Landmarks that could be impacted by some of these proposals hold very fond memories for me -- places like the football field, baseball field, the mine tailings to the west, and the Scott Lancaster bridge to name a few. I know that there are no easy answers to the problems of the corridor. It does seem that utilizing the least impact solution seems like the place to start. I would encourage CDOT to implement an Adaptive Management Plan by fixing the pinch points of traffic in the corridor and then reevaluating the impact. This could be implemented with available funds and started in the near future. Consideration should also be given to alternate routes through the mountains and long range plans for high speed mass transit.</p> <p>I am now a Frontier Airlines Capt. and fly over the entire Corridor almost weekly, I look down on the area with a great deal of fondness. It would be a terrible shame to see this area turned into one more concrete ribbon through the wonderful area.</p> <p>John A. Howell</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	354	Howell, Sue	Public	2/16/2005	<p>My name is Sue Howell, and I'm a proud resident of Clear Creek County. I'd like to comment on the environmental justice. In my eyes, there is none in CDOT's preferred alternatives.</p> <p>I'd like to point out an article in today's Denver Post. It's about a study funded by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences that is published in this month's journal; cancer, epidemiology, biomarkers and prevention. It links in the womb chromosome damage to elevated exposures of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons more commonly known as PAHs.</p> <p>There are more than 100 PAHs that are in the byproducts in combustion from car and truck exhaust. Fetuses of pregnant women exposed to the higher pollution levels showed 53 percent more chromosomal changes. These genetic changes are the kind linked to cancer. For the communities that lie in the path of an extended I-70 of trucks and cars, there is no environmental justice in your preferred alternatives.</p> <p>If CDOT is serious about the purpose of the public hearings and citizen input, then you have a moral and technical responsibility to go back to the drawing board, discard your preferred alternatives, take a new approach to the previous discarded alternatives.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	181	Howell, Sue	Public	1/15/2005	<p>Okay. My comment is, I object to the fact that there is not a period of time to ask questions, only a period of time to make comments. I realize that most of the questions that I would ask will be addressed in Tier II, but like everyone else that spoke, I feel like Tier II is too late to address what my questions are.</p> <p>One of the questions that I have is noise mitigation. I live in Idaho Springs, and all of the noise mitigation that I see does not adequately address the 82 decibels that we can anticipate. It might work -- the mitigation might work on flat areas such as surrounding T-Rex, but in mountain communities where people live at various different levels above the project, the noise mitigations -- things that they have offered doesn't work.</p> <p>Let me think. That's it for now. I'll be at other hearings.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	523	Howell, Sue	Public	5/20/2005	<p>I am particularly concerned about the noise and the 72 decibels estimated at the water wheel in Idaho springs with additional traffic projections. The mitigation that the PEIS provides seem inadequate. Several years ago, Cecelia Joy made a CDOT presentation at the Idaho springs City Hall on a warm fall evening when the doors were open to provide ventilation. After speaking for several minutes, she requested that the doors be closed, as she found the noise to be distracting! This is what the residents of Idaho Springs live with at the present level of traffic. It is no small wonder that we are opposed to 15 years of construction and increased capacity. I am also adding 10 points of concern with the PEIS.</p> <p>Comments for I-70 PEIS/Clear Creek County</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the Executive Summary/p 34 the report states that the I-70 corridor "offers views of historic mountain towns and occasional glimpses of wildlife." Most residents of Clear Creek County find this erroneous. The viewing of wildlife is a constant fact of daily life. Floyd Hill is a frequent habitat of elk and many times a danger to traffic due to their frequent crossing of the highway. Big Horn Sheep are often seen grazing the grass next to the Highway close to the twin tunnels. From there they migrate to Empire and Georgetown where the Division of Wildlife has a viewing station on the east side of the highway. Deer roam the entire corridor, as well as fox, mountain lion and an "occasional" wolf. Wildlife crossings are a necessity in this area and should not be an afterthought. We would like acknowledgement that the area over the top of the twin tunnels provides an important and frequently used passage for deer and other wildlife. Game trails are visible from the frontage road. The report states that the corridor " offers views of historic mountain towns" however the necessity of sound barriers to mitigate the noise will destroy these views.</li> <li>The study neglects to acknowledge the existence of the James Peak Wilderness area as well as the Mountain Evans Wilderness Area. Of many Wilderness Areas addressed in the study, James Peak is the closest in proximity to I-70. The study suggests that the visual impact to these areas will be negligible due to less pollution when traffic moves smoothly as opposed to stop and go. It fails to take into account the stop and go traffic with 15 years of construction.</li> <li>In the mitigation Summary, 3-19-1, it states that special consideration is given to the Genessee Bridge over I-70 since it is "the last glimpse of the Continental Divide from West bound I-70 until West of Silver Plume." This is incorrect. From Idaho Springs to the far side of Empire Junction there is a view of the snow covered peaks of the Continental Divide. This is approximately 8 miles of spectacular scenery. Special Design consideration should also be given to this section of the highway.</li> <li>In the Cumulative Impact Analysis, p 4-31, the study states that "Planned future development will consume 32% of the Corridor View shed Area. Pressures for additional increased development from alternatives might alter the highly valued Corridor character from a rural mountain character to an urban character." This drastic change to the visual experience of the traveler and the residents was not taken into consideration when analyzing the visual impact of the preferred alternatives.</li> <li>Health impacts. Where is it? The study indicates that with the improved flow of traffic there will be less pollution in spite of 150% increase in traffic. There is no mention made of the 15 years of construction with stop and go traffic. There are numerous studies that show increased health risks to those living and working within 250 yards of heavy traffic areas. Idaho springs has 2 schools, a Recreational Center and a Senior Center within 100 yards of the highway. Carlson Elementary School has been at this location for over 100 years. Any detours during construction will take traffic on Colorado Blvd and within 10-15 yards of classrooms and the playground. Five historic churches are also located on Colorado Blvd which is the only alternate route through town. A study of the health impacts of the preferred alternatives should be included in this PEIS.</li> <li>Environmental Justice 3.11 In spite of the fact that the PEIS attempts to discuss affordable housing, I see no assurances that those small affordable homes in eastern and central Idaho Springs and Silver Plume that are extremely close to the existing I-70 will not be adversely affected if not eliminated. (the study mentions homes in western I. S. not being impacted) Some of these homes are occupied by elderly residents or low income workers who can not afford to purchase a home in another area. There is limited room in the valley to build alternative affordable housing. Clear Creek County has one lumber yard, one pharmacy and one supermarket. All are within approximately 25 yards of the existing I-70. Not only is the County and the town dependent on the revenues from these businesses, but the same is true of the residents. Elderly and low income populations often have limited ability to travel outside of the County for these services. 3.11.62 states that the exact extent of the direct impacts to low income and non-low income populations cannot be determined at the Tier I level. They do go on to state that the social effects, such as noise and diminution of aesthetic values would be the same for low income as for non-low income populations. How was this measured? It seems only reasonable to assume that those living next to the highway will be more heavily impacted than those living on the mountain side. This Environmental Justice information is invalid. Is this an attempt to sacrifice the affordable housing and shopping in Clear Creek for the convenience of 2nd home owners further to the west?</li> <li>Economic impact: Since the majority of the construction will be in Clear Creek County and is estimated to take 15 years to complete, it is also reasonable to assume that the economic impact will be devastating. In spite of this, the PEIS does not make any attempt to evaluate the impact as a stand alone county. Recreational impacts are mentioned in the report, but the impact on Loveland Basin and the Rafting industry may be enormous. The revenues from these activities contribute considerably to our County's economy. Do we have any assurances that the Creek will not be moved again? The study looks at the impact of nine counties averaged together, even though some of the counties are not in the I-70 corridor. This invalidates this part of the study.</li> <li>HOV/HOT lanes. As indicated in the preferred alternative, one would enter at the US 6 junction (Kermitt's) with I-70 and would not be able to exit until Empire Junction. Is this Economic Justice? Once traveling in this lane, it makes it impossible for one to exit into Idaho Springs for fuel, sight-seeing or to visit a restaurant. It also means that emergency services and residents cannot by pass traffic jams and get to their destinations in Idaho Springs. This is a biased alternative in favor of through travelers.</li> <li>The PEIS is a lengthy study that at first glance seems to cover a myriad of considerations. However, there are many deficiencies as mentioned above. There is no indication in the study as to how the various impacts were weighed in making the final determination of the preferred alternatives. Did the environmental and community values play a role in the decision or was it truly only based on cost?</li> <li>At the public hearings, many individuals commented on the questionable future of the economy and</li> </ol>	Online

Categorized Comment	63	Hruska, J.F.	Public	1/12/2005	<p>the availability of fossil fuels. In light of this, I would encourage CDOT to implement an Adaptive Management Plan by fixing the pinch points of traffic in the corridor and then reevaluating the impact. This could be implemented with available funds and started in the near future. Consideration should also be given to alternate routes through the mountains and long range plans for high speed mass transit.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	742	Hudnut, Kate	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion) 2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address. Kate Hudnut kate@gatherhouse.com 20F RiverPark Drive Breckenridge CO 80424</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	812	Hudson, Miller	Public	2/26/2005	<p>I-70 PEIS PUBLIC HEARING STATEMENT February 26, 2005 - Winter Park, Colorado</p> <p>My name is Miller Hudson and I live in Denver. As you know, I've spent much of the past eight years studying the mobility challenge along the I-70 mountain corridor --- first as Executive Director of CARTS --- the Corridor Alliance for a Rapid Transit Solution ---and then as Executive Director of the Colorado Intermountain Fixed Guideway Authority. Four years ago, when the PEIS process commenced I predicted that it would prove a forced march to a pre-determined conclusion --- that, at the end of the day, only highway alternatives would be recommended by CDOT and that all true, high-speed transit alternatives would be eliminated.</p> <p>It gives me no satisfaction to have been proven right. Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to take a moment and review how we arrived at the current draft recommendations. An utterly unqualified firm was selected to conduct this study. We were assured that this was a positive move because the consultant could hire the very best talent to supplement their obvious inexperience. My appraisal was that using a firm whose revenues would come almost exclusively from this single project guaranteed CDOT a team that would be both suggestible and pliant. That has, in fact, been the case.</p> <p>I doubt, until this PEIS is challenged in court --- as it will be, and depositions are taken under oath that we can ever understand how the draft report was constructed or its conclusions reached. Consequently, I am not going to waste my few minutes today raising objections or asking pointed questions. To do so would be a waste of breath. The record speaks for itself.</p> <p>Early in this process I attended a meeting at the CDOT offices at Kipling and Hampden where it was proposed that discretionary money be spent to conduct a "user study" that could provide a "snapshot" of traffic patterns on I-70. Before any discussion proceeded I asked for an assurance that this snapshot would never be used to construct the ridership data that would be so crucial to the PEIS analysis. I was told that the user study would never be used for such a purpose --- that it was statistically inadequate, and that at least four weekends, summer and winter, would be required. I confirmed this recollection with Deb Miller, the project manager for HNTB at the time and now the Secretary of Transportation for the state of Kansas.</p> <p>The two weekends that underlie the user study data includes a late March weekend in a year when several of the major I-70 corridor ski areas had already closed because of a lack of snow. Nonetheless, this data now underlies the ridership data used for such a purpose --- once, CIGFA hired a modeling expert and requested a meeting with the PEIS team to determine whether its modeling approach met industry standards. CDOT refused to turn over these models for our inspection and assured us that an expert peer review committee would provide the quality control we believed was needed.</p> <p>All I know today is that this peer review committee met once, that it severely criticized the preferred methodology recommended by the PEIS consultant, and then the committee was never convened again. I am also aware that the lead modeler alleges he was pressured to produce results favorable to highway alternatives, and --- when he refused to do so --- was fired. The truth about the validity of the numbers used to justify the preferred recommendations in the draft PEIS will only be clarified in a courtroom.</p> <p>Earlier this week I attended the PEIS hearing in Silverthorne and listened to Summit County Commissioner Bob French and others support a six-lane widening of I-70 as an important first step in reducing congestion. I would like to examine the wisdom of that approach for a minute. By CDOT's own admission, this widening will require 15 years to complete. As long as any part of the highway between Floyd Hill and the continental divide tunnels remains four lanes in width, there will be no relief for Summit County or anyone else. The congestion point may move as work progresses, but the entire six laning must be complete before any relief will be felt --- that is forecast for 2025, twenty years from now.</p> <p>And that presumes work will begin in 2010, which strikes me as highly dubious. In 2010 our next Governor will be running for reelection. For the first time in a dozen years, new highway dollars will become available as we pay off the T-REX bonds. A political scrum will occur as projects throughout the state compete for funding priority at the Transportation Commission. Can the I-70 corridor out-muscle I-25 north to Fort Collins? I doubt it. CDOT has suggested that tolling the tunnels might generate additional dollars. Would it be fair to ask corridor residents to pay tolls seven days a week so that Front Range residents like myself, can play tourist once a month? I don't think so.</p> <p>In closing, I want to point out a major deficiency in the PEIS that needs to be remedied before a final recommendation is made. Commissioner French supported highway widening on Wednesday, at least in part, because he doesn't believe that we can significantly change the driving habits of Colorado residents. I would suggest that he is dead wrong about that. Denver area residents committed to a four billion dollar transportation investment this past November. The entire FasTracks system will be operational by 2016, only five years into the fifteen-year construction of a six lane widening of I-70.</p> <p>Three million Coloradans will live within a fifteen-minute drive of a FasTracks station. And FasTracks will be able to deliver 20,000 skiers or campers or bikers an hour to a high-speed AGS system. The West Corridor line will open in 2013 and could probably be accelerated by a year or two, if needed. The bottom line is that the entire transportation environment changed dramatically last November. The PEIS analysis has to go back to square one and consider the impact of a 120 miles of widened feeder system which will have been in operation for a decade before CDOT can get I-70 widened and I believe it will take far longer than that.</p> <p>The PEIS analysis shows that an AGS system would result in less congestion on the existing 4-lane highway, with no improvements, than will be experienced on the 6-lane highway it is recommending. It is time to step back and return to square one. When the Southwest light rail line first opened, the 200-space lot at the Mineral station was overwhelmed on opening day. Today eighteen hundred spaces frequently overflow. Even Coloradans are capable of changing their travel habits.</p> <p>At least two groups are currently considering a private high-speed transit proposal for the I-70 corridor. I believe a solicitation of interest by CDOT might surface more bidders. The requisite technology is available, affordable and cost effective. If it were interfaced with FasTracks it should throw off cash and help pay a significant part of its initial capital cost. The PEIS team needs to undertake this analysis --- quit stacking their numbers against transit alternatives --- and make a recommendation in its final report that meets the preference of corridor residents and the test of common sense.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
Categorized Comment	413	Hudson, Miller	Public	2/26/2005	<p>Good afternoon. My name is Miller Hudson, and I live in Denver. As most of you on the panel know, I spent much of the past eight years studying the mobility challenges along the I-70 mountain corridor, first as the executive director of CARTS, the Corridor Alliance For a Rapid Transit Solution, then as executive director of the Colorado Intermountain Fixed Guideway Authority.</p> <p>Four years ago when the PEIS process commenced, I predicted that it would prove to be a forced march to a predetermined conclusion and that at the end of the day only highway alternatives would be recommended by CDOT and that all true high-speed transit alternatives would be recommended by CDOT and that all true high-speed alternatives would have been eliminated. It gives me little satisfaction to have been proven right.</p> <p>Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to take a moment to review how we arrived at the current draft recommendations. An utterly unqualified firm was selected to conduct this study. We were assured --- we were assured that this was a positive move because the consultant could hire the very best talent to supplement their obvious inexperience. My appraisal was that using a firm whose revenues would come almost exclusively from this single project guaranteed CDOT a team that would prove both suggestible and pliant. That has, in fact, been the case.</p> <p>I doubt until this PEIS is challenged in court, as it will be, and depositions are taken under oath that we will ever understand how the draft report was constructed or the conclusions that it reached. Consequently, I'm not going to waste my few minutes today raising objections or asking pointed</p>	Transcripts

questions. To do so would be a waste of breath. The record speaks for itself.

Early in this process, I attended a meeting at the CDOT offices at Kipling and Hampden where it was proposed that directional monies be spent to conduct a user study that could provide a snapshot of traffic patterns along I-70.

Before any discussion proceeded, I asked for an assurance that this snapshot would never be used to construct the ridership data that would be so crucial to the PEIS analysis. I was told that the user study would never be used for such a purpose, that it was statistically inadequate and that at least four weekends, summer and winter, would be required.

I confirmed this recollection recently with Deb Miller, the project manager for HNTV at the time and now the secretary of transportation for the State of Kansas. The two weekends that underlie the user study data includes a late March weekend in a year when several of the major I-70 corridor ski areas had already closed because of a lack of snow. Nonetheless, this data now underlies the ridership study.

Having been lied to once, CIFGA hired a modeling expert and requested a meeting with the PEIS team to determine whether its modeling approach met industry standards. CDOT refused to turn over their models for our inspection and assured us that an expert peer review committee would provide the quality control that we felt was needed.

All that I actually know today is that this peer review committee met once, that it severely criticized the preferred methodology recommended by the PEIS consultant and then the committee was never convened again.

I am also aware that the lead modeler alleges he was pressured to produce results favorable to highway alternatives, and when he refused to do so, he was fired.

The truth about the validity of the numbers used to justify the preferred recommendations in the draft PEIS can only be clarified in a courtroom.

Earlier this week I did a PEIS hearing in Silverthorne and listened to Summit County Commissioner Bob French and others support a six-lane widening of I-70 as an important first step in reducing congestion. I would like to examine the wisdom of that approach for a minute.

By CDOT's own admission, this widening will require 15 years to complete. As long as any portion of a highway between Floyd Hill and the Continental Divide tunnels reduce four lanes in width, there will be no relief for Summit County or any other place to the west. The congestion points may move as work progresses, but the entire six lanes must be complete before any relief will be felt. That is forecast in 2025, 20 years from now. And that presumes that work will actually begin in 2010, which strikes me as highly dubious.

I'm going to skip over some stuff in the interest of time. In closing, I want to point out a major deficiency in this PEIS that needs to be remedied before a final recommendation is made.

Commissioner French supported highway widening on Wednesday at least in part because he doesn't believe that we can significantly change the driving habits of Colorado residents. I suggest that he's dead wrong about that.

Denver area residents committed a \$4 billion transportation investment this past November. The entire FasTracks system will be operational by 2016. Only five years into the 15-year construction of the six-lane widening of I-70, three million Coloradans will live within a 15-minute drive of a FasTracks station, and FasTracks will be able to deliver 20,000 skiers or campers or hikers or bikers an hour to a high-speed AGS system.

The west end corridor line will open in 2013 and can probably be accelerated by a year or two. The bottom line is, the entire transportation environment changed dramatically last November. The PEIS analysis has to go back to square one and consider the impacts of 120 miles of a transit feeder system, which will have been in operation for a decade before CDOT can widen I-70.

I have other comments, but let me quote Abraham Lincoln, my favorite Republican. Our case is new, we must thus think anew and act anew.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	498	Hugins, Phyllis	Public	5/14/2005	I am traveling so do not have the draft... I am concerned about the health of those living near the planned expansion highway. I feel more study should be made before a decision is made to expan.  Phyllis Hugins, Frisco	Online
Categorized Comment	615	Hula, Dave	Public	5/24/2005	I'd like to see the 6-lane 55mph or 6-lane 65mph alternatives pursued, including reversible lanes (4 by 2) to handle peak period volume. As long as petroleum products are cheap, people will want their individual freedom, and ridership on bus, train or other mass transport options will be low. I don't want to subsidize these mass transit options. Mass transit is just not practical as people have a multitude of destinations once they arrive in the mountains.  To pay for these improvements, I have no problem charging tolls. I would recommend a system like I've seen in California whereby the toll goes up during peak periods to help encourage off-peak travel. In addition, tolls should be higher for single occupant vehicles to help encourage carpooling. Also, don't limit the additional lanes to high occupancy vehicles only; let everyone use them but charge a toll like I mentioned above. When I attended some of the first I70 open houses a couple of years ago, CDOT at that time said tolls were not politically palatable. I hope this view is changing. We will need a lot of money for this overhaul, and the projected budgets in the PEIS are likely low. We should also consider charges on those who cause accidents that tie up the highway.  And please, please don't try to build a monorail. Note that many people like to lug their toys up to the mountains and this (AGS) and other mass transit options just aren't practical.  Thanks for listening.	Online
Categorized Comment	250	Humble, Omer	Public	2/26/2005	February 26, 2005  Cecelia Joy, Project Manager CDOT Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO, 80011  SUBJECT:I-70 West Mountain Corridor Proposal  I oppose widening I-70 on the following basis. Several decades ago, the U. S. Congress wisely decided to develop a national grid of interstate highways, primarily to promote economic development and for military purposes. That grid has since been built and the primary purposes have been achieved.  In order to accomplish this effort, some of the best educated, most experienced and talented planners, engineers, geologist etc. were hired. These disciplines of talent continue to be responsible for highway maintenance and improvements. As highways become congested with traffic, these employees solve the problems as their education and thought processes have trained them: pour more concrete and lay more asphalt!  An objective review of the odds of probability will clearly show that this answer cannot always be the appropriate one. Such is the case of the current proposal for I-70 West.  I have owned my home two miles west of Idaho Springs, Co. since 1969 — that date precedes the building of I-70 through Clear Creek County. I personally observed the destruction of historic buildings and sites in Idaho Springs as well as many mining facilities throughout Clear Creek and other counties impacted by the construction of I-70. The national need for such a highway was understood and accepted as the appropriate solution by most residents impacted.  The current situation does not equate to the pre I-70 needs! No one can question the fact that I-70 west of Denver can easily and comfortably accommodate the volume of traffic using it EXCEPT during peak periods of recreational traffic by non residents of Clear Creek County. These brief periods are dominantly limited to weekends during ski season which constitutes only a very small percentage of the 365day year. Even during these periods, the traffic is no worse, or less worse, than that which occurs on I-70 and I-25 in the Denver metro area on every week day! Please analyze the level of traffic problems throughout the state and deploy time, money and effort where the most need exist. I submit that the widening of I-70 will be near the bottom of any such priority list.  I mentioned recreational traffic by non local residents: I and I think most local residents, do not have any problem with everyone's right to enjoy recreational activities; however, when these activities harm, in a major way, the rights of local citizens, then it is incumbent on government to protect my existing rights! All logic will clearly show that if a cost/benefit analysis is performed wherein the benefit of non local residents' recreational use of an expanded I-70 when compared to the costs born by local residents: the widening of the highway is not an appropriate solution!  I do not consider the traffic problem to be sufficient to warrant the time and money that is being spent.	Written

					<p>and I know that the proposed solution of widening I-70 during a one to two decade time frame is wrong. Such activities, with the resulting lack of access to Idaho Springs will essentially destroy it's businesses and ruin the lives of their owners, employees and other residents of this beautiful historic town.</p> <p>If your education and experience will not allow you to solve traffic problems without pouring more concrete and laying more asphalt, then consider building roads to Summit County from other points along I-25 both north and south of Denver. Larger, or additional, airports in Summit County would greatly help out of state tourist. Analyze solutions to traffic congestion around the country, even in the Denver Metro area: mass transit is certainly the current trend!</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration to my thoughts and comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Omer R. Humble 4083 Fall River Rd. Idaho Springs, CO 80452</p>	
Categorized Comment	768	Hummer, Scott	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	372	Hunt, Christina	Public	2/16/2005	<p>My name is Christina Hunt, and I live in Evergreen and work in downtown Denver.</p> <p>I just think you're wonderful, and I am clearly a proponent of widening the highway, whether it be one lane, two lanes, three lanes, eight lanes. And I'm very much a proponent of a system of transportation that would basically replace eight to ten lanes of highway and make it something because [INAUDIBLE] in our state of Colorado.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	222	Illig, Janice	Public	2/26/2005	<p>I believe Colorado can be seen as a leader in transportation if we do more research on something like a monorail through the mountains. It is short sighted, I feel to merely put in more lanes. California has tried that and they still have unbelievable traffic. We need to look further ahead and see what will work in the long term - not just do a short term fix. Janice Illig</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	158	Jacobsen, Chris	Public	2/11/2005	<p>First of all, I would like to say that there has been an amazing amount of thorough research into this issue and the documents created are of high quality.</p> <p>Generally, however, I really think you are trying solve a "hammer" problem with a "wrecking ball" solution. I completely disagree with your assessment that targeted fixes at certain locations won't meet the capacity needs through 2025, and that only a complete capacity increase, like a six-lane highway for the entire study corridor, will do the trick. I'm not familiar with Vail Pass since I don't get that far very often, but I'm very familiar with the conditions on weekends and weekdays from Denver through Silverthorne. ALL the congestion is caused by two areas--Eisenhower Tunnel and the area between the twin tunnels and Hwy 6. For Eisenhower Tunnel, the only solution is to expand the tunnel itself (or add another tunnel) to accommodate an additional lane in both directions so that traffic isn't reduced from three to two lanes. For the twin tunnels to Hwy 6 area, you must improve the road so that speeds do not fall below 65 mph. No other solution will work and that is your only problem. You do not need another lane there, you only need to straighten the road. You may need to abandon the canyon roadway and build a new road that travels south of Idaho Springs and stays at that elevation to connect to Hyland Hills. All the traffic problems between Eisenhower tunnel and Hyland Hills originates at the twin tunnel/Hwy 6 slow-down to 45mph. There might be some slow-down at Fall River, but that is also due to the decrease in speed limit for the curve. Straighten the road! No need for additional lanes.</p> <p>Second, I didn't see any mention anywhere of dynamic speed limit signs even being considered. This would be a HUGE help, as I have seen this system implemented elsewhere. The ONLY reason there is such congestion is because people drive as fast as they can until they are forced to slow-down, either because of a loss of a lane, or because of sharp curves. If you have a speed management system that slows traffic down long before a bottleneck area, the bottleneck will open back up. An analogy would be a ketchup bottle--turn it upside down and it's practically impossible to get ketchup to come out because it all is trying to flow out at the same time. Turn it a slight incline and it flows out nicely. The dynamic speed limit signs could be placed every mile or so along the study corridor and when traffic became congested at, say, the twin tunnels, the speed limit showing on the dynamic signs starting at Dumont or Hyland Hills would reduce accordingly. The idea would be to slow traffic down to the speed at which traffic is flowing at the bottleneck. At the very least, it would be much better to travel at 35 mph than stop and go--safer and less frustrating.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	300	Jeffrey, Nancy	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Hi, I'm Nancy Jeffrey. I sit on the city council of Idaho Springs, and I'm also president of Carlson Elementary PTA. And probably my main reason for being here is really about the kind of future we're going to end up building.</p> <p>And I do have a statement, but first I want to say thank you to a couple of people who educated me about this whole process, and that's Dennis Lunbery, our mayor, and Bill Macy, and Mary Jane Loevlie, and Bruce Schneider, and Randy Wheelock and all his wonderful e-mails. They are truly -- and there's a lot of other people out here too. They are truly the Davids in our David and Goliath fight. And quite frankly, that is what this is, or it seems like it. And, you know, I'm just scared that Goliath is big enough and is not hearing a damn word.</p> <p>So here is my statement: About a year ago I sat in a meeting and listened to all the concerns that the residents of this area had with the possible alternatives that you, CDOT, presented to us. I asked you then and I will ask you again: How will we survive you? I believe it to be morally wrong on many levels when you come in here and shove only proposals that benefit you and your budget down our throats.</p> <p>If you cannot come up with enough money to do this correctly, a way which may pay for the historical, environmental, and high mountain standard of living that we currently enjoy, then you should go back to the drawing boards and find more money and do this correctly. The only thing that you've shown the communities of Clear Creek County is that all you care about is lessening the time it will take for skiers to go through our part of the county on their way to Vail in the year 2025.</p> <p>And the fact remains that in the year 2025, your brand-new highway will instantly be an out-of-date, not enough lanes, dinosaur. The currently preferred choices will choke and kill this area of the mountains. Maybe you don't care, but we who have bought land and homes here and give to the area everyday of our lives really do care.</p> <p>Unless I pack up now and move, my children who are 5 and 7 years of age will live through a dusty cone zone that is likely to increase their chances for allergies, asthma, and possibly even hearing problems. They will have to live in a dusty construction zone that could cause them and all of us to get silicosis, a disabling, nonreversible and sometimes fatal lung disease caused by inhaling dust from building roadways that contain extremely fine particles of crystalline silica.</p> <p>Tell me, is your answer to these problems going to be ignoring the men, women, and children who live in this corridor and asking us to wear high-efficiency filtering masks, which, no doubt, your partners in this huge undertaking will probably be wearing for the next 10 to 15 years?</p> <p>I believe I've only scratched the surface of physical health to humans. I've not even talked yet about how it affects the creatures who have lived here far longer than any of us, our historical districts that will be raped by your project alternatives, or the economic health of our town, if we even have communities left after you finish with us. All this for a skier who wants to get to Vail.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	550	Jennings, Chris	Public	5/23/2005	<p>My comments are in regards to the human Gulch area that will be affected by the new construction and future traffic in the area. Noise will only increase with traffic and construction making it difficult to enjoy the surrounding area. Soundwalls would be a necessity for future traffic in the area, but in the short term would be needed due to construction noise. Therefore it would be cost effective to install soundwalls/berms during proposed construction and include them in design rather than add'l cost to add later. Furthermore, wildlife, Herman Gulch users, Watrous Gulch users, and Continental Divide Trail hikers would all benefit from soundwalls. . . users are in the area year round (everyone knows the powder cache at Watrous). The wildlife aspect is most concerning because I believe we have an obligation to protect those creatures who were already there. In fact, I believe there are some laws that state this as a requirement when making such construction changes that impact the environment.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	565	Jennings, Marion	Public	5/23/2005	<p>EMERGE is a homeowner's group that represents the residents of southeastern Clear Creek County. The Board of Directors have all agreed to support the Regionally Preferred Alternative that was proposed on May 19th. The Board would like to see this proposal get a full evaluation. We believe it will have the lowest level of impact to our environment and our community. The Board also would like to support the development of mass transit along with highway improvements in the critical problem areas.</p>	Online

Categorized Comment	93	Jensen, Don	Public	1/19/2005	I prefer the Preservation/Combination option #'s 7, 8, 9.  I would also support toll charges to pay for improvements.  Toll charges are the only way to keep up with growing costs and needs. And the users of the highway are the ones who pay for it.	Form
Categorized Comment	194	Jewell, Linda	Public	2/16/2005	As a resident of Clear Creek County, I have serious concerns about the option chosen to alleviate the congestion problems on I-70 west of Denver. I realize that funding and lack of an alternative route create severe challenges, but I am concerned that there is not adequate attention given to solutions other than simply widening the existing highway. In Clear Creek County, the destruction of historical structures, the destruction of the lifestyle desired by those who are living here, and the economic effects on local businesses resulting from the highway construction over the period of time projected are unacceptable. In spite of protestations that local concerns are being addressed, there does not seem to be a serious attempt to come to a compromise solution. Please keep an open mind when considering alternatives, and consider a long-term cost rather than using just initial construction estimates.  Thank you for your consideration. Linda Jewell	Online
Categorized Comment	560	Jewell, Linda	Public	5/23/2005	I remain concerned that CDOT is not taking into consideration all the information available about impacts on the economy of the areas affected, on water and air quality, and on wildlife.  I realize that something must be done to alleviate the congestion problems on I-70, but I believe that the solution must be determined based on long-term benefits and based on minimal impacts to the areas adjacent to the corridor.  I understand that the I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition has developed what they consider to be a regionally preferred alternative to the CDOT proposal which simply paves additional lanes. I am requesting that you seriously study and consider this alternative proposal.  Thank you. Linda L. Jewell	Online
Categorized Comment	709	Johnson, Chris	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  I feel mass transit is the only long term answer to pollution, congestion, and economic energy independence. Thank you, christammy2004@msn.com 06 Miners Creek Rd. Frisco, Co. 80443	Written
Categorized Comment	602	Johnson, David	Public	5/24/2005	After reviewing the document and listening to the presentations, I strongly advocate minimal or no road improvements (no capacity or lane expansion) and a transit option that will move passengers efficiently between Denver and Eagle Counties. However, the transit option must not exacerbate the alarming projected increases in population and employment for Eagle County and the surrounding mountain communities. According to the State Demographer, Eagle County's population will nearly double by 2030 and commuting to Eagle County will increase from 1000 persons per day to over 30,000 per day. Capacity improvements will aggravate these growth projections and impacts.  Traffic is increasing on the I-70 corridor. LOS F is already a problem, and it will worsen. Nonetheless, highway widening is a poor solution. It will be extremely expensive, and the result will be aesthetically ghastly. The current I-70 infrastructure provides a lesson in the costs and benefits of running an interstate through the mountains. It does provide tourism revenue, it does provide unprecedented mobility for motorists and for freight. However, it has compromised the movement of wildlife and allowed unparalleled residential and commercial development in the most beautiful and fragile parts of the United States. Expanding I-70 from four lanes to six lanes will increase mobility for the short term (in two or three years it will be filled to capacity again), while destroying the character and the natural beauty of the mountain communities forever.  Adding lanes to I-70 and/or a high-capacity, high-speed transit option is a subsidy for developers to build more houses and big box stores and to create a pharaonic linear metropolis from Denver to Glenwood Canyon and beyond. No thank you. I cherish the intermountain region for its unique communities and incredible beauty. For these I willingly sacrifice mobility, economic development, availability of material goods, and the other benefits that ugly, capital-intensive infrastructure improvements will provide.	Online
Categorized Comment	428	Johnson, Deborah	Public	4/5/2005	I am strongly in favor of a fixed guideway rapid transit system as this would minimize new impacts to wildlife and water quality.  I am strongly against widening I70. This would damage water quality, scenery, tourism, wildlife habitats, and quality of life.	Online
Categorized Comment	289	Johnson, Erin	Public	2/9/2005	I want to say that I'm not opposed to change, and I think that I-70 does need something to -- a facelift to carry it into the future. But I don't want it to be at the expense of the environment.  I did want to say that I didn't -- don't want to see any lighting through the I-70 corridor through Idaho Springs and Empire. I'm opposed to light pollution. And that I do -- I live up in Saint Mary's, so I get a birds-eye view of the I-70 corridor. And I do see a lot of shrouds of smog hanging over it every now and then. I don't know if it's inversion going on, but I do see a lot of pollution hanging there sometimes. And that's why I don't think the six-lane highway alternative would be very good; it would just make that cloud even more brown and purple.  And I just think that maybe the advanced guided system or the rail system or something that isn't going to use a lot of fossil fuels would be a better alternative than the six-lane highway.  I think the last thing I wanted to say is that I'm impressed that CDOT is considering the wildlife linkages along the I-70 corridor. I think it's important that they take into consideration wildlife movement and habitats in that area. And I'm just really excited that they're doing that. And I'd like to see the one at Fall River done -- they want to make it easier for the animals to get down to the river and cross that highway, and I think that's wonderful.  But my big "no, no" is no lighting. Thanks.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	593	Jones, Constance	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	The Summit County Chamber of Commerce, a business/industry association representing over 600 members, supports the I-70 Central Mountain Transportation Corridor Coalition's Regionally Preferred Alternative as submitted on May 24, 2005 in cooperation with Rural Resort Region and Northwest Colorado Council of Governments. Respectfully, Constance Jones, Executive Director (970)668-2051	Online
Categorized Comment	662	Colorado Environmental Coalition	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/20/2005	Colorado Environmental Coalition www.ourcolorado.org  May 20, 2005  Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011  RE: Comments on Draft PEIS  Dear Ms. Joy:  The Colorado Environmental Coalition would like to express some brief comments on the draft I-70 West Mountain Corridor PEIS.  As you may know the Colorado Environmental Coalition, founded in 1965, is dedicated to protecting Colorado's natural heritage and quality of life through citizen advocacy. Composed of 95 member groups with a combined membership of 150,000 Coloradans, the Coalition works in communities across the state to encourage responsible growth and healthy livable communities, safeguard wilderness, and promote the sustainable use of energy and water resources.  The Coalition has a keen interest in seeing that a responsible and sustainable transportation plan is implemented for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. Any plan implemented should protect the quality of life, wildlife values, sensitive habitat, historic and cultural resources of the mountain communities.  We realize there is no easy solution for solving the traffic and growth woes of the I-70 mountain corridor	Written

					<p>but we do support a serious look into rapid transit alternatives to serve the corridor in the future. We would like to see transit choices and alternatives stay on the table and continue to be reviewed in hopes of finding a feasible solution. We are concerned that additional lanes would be excessive, the bigger "footprint" of additional lanes means increased damage to water quality, rivers, wetlands and wildlife habitat. Colorado's population is increasing quickly and with that growth comes more cars and increased health risks from auto and truck emissions. We encourage CDOT to consider rising pollution levels and their adverse health effects in the future planning process.</p> <p>The Coalition would be encouraged if the EIS alternatives analysis considered the full impact of transportation patterns on land use, specifically on how land uses would change if the highway is grossly expanded and/or if a variety of transit options were implemented. We would also like to see the EIS institute an effective and improved modeling analysis that assesses the overall development impacts in the mountain corridor.</p> <p>We believe this effort is essential to help ease the travel burden, provide transportation alternatives and improve the quality of life for this important region of Colorado.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Sincerely, Elise Jones, Executive Director</p>	
Categorized Comment	252	Jones, Mary	Public	3/2/2005	<p>I totally don't understand how it can be better to blast away mountain and add lanes to I-70 - which will increase the number of cars going through the area - when an elevated train would move hundreds of people, without their cars, over existing roadway in most places. Please, please do not abandon the idea of a train, monorail, whatever you want to call it. So much time, money, environment, and human discomfort are at stake. Historical sites, homes, animal life, etc. will all be adversely affected. No one disagrees that something has to be done, but more automobiles should be our last choice. Move just the people through as efficiently as possible.</p> <p>I was fortunate enough to work for 7 months in Sydney, Australia last year. I never needed a car because their train and bus service is so effective. We could learn a great deal from other countries regarding this issue.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	349	Jones, R.L.	Public	2/16/2005	<p>My name is R.L. Jones. I'm a 77-year resident of Clear Creek County. I was present when they put 6 and 40 through; also when they put 70 through. And now we're going through it once again.</p> <p>I've seen the time when I went to get out on the highway from in front of my house on Colorado Boulevard and had to wait an hour and a half to enter onto the highway just because of the way traffic was on a Sunday afternoon.</p> <p>Also, as a watershed engineer and some of the things that are presented in the EIS, the pattern for the highway expansion to six lanes, that type of thing, concerns us deeply.</p> <p>I-70 is predominantly built through Clear Creek County and mine tailing. And the rock walls alongside the road that they're going to have to go into are heavily mineral-laden. So when we go build this new highway and start tearing up the four lanes that exist there and go to six lanes, we're moving all of the mine dirt and tailings around again and putting it into the creek. We're doing further channelization of Clear Creek, which was started by the I-70 construction, and it really hurts the habitat of the fishery and the scenery.</p> <p>So we're real interested in the processes and methods of handling all of this destruction in addition to what it does to local community during the time of construction. You can almost bring the production operation of a community to a halt during the construction process because of the narrowness of the valley. We saw that happen for a period of time during I-70, and I saw it happen for a period of time during construction of 6 and 40.</p> <p>So the process of building this is very slow, and I urge you to study that -- in Tier II, study that in some detail. We urge that they really take a hard look at what this will do to the water. Because some of the people who live out in this part of the country do use our water. And if it becomes heavily mineral-laden, we can have a real important problem.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	359	Jones, Tom	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Thank you very much. I'd like to thank the officials here tonight for giving us this opportunity to speak to you.</p> <p>My name is Tom Jones, and I own two retail stores in Summit County. And we sell backpacks and fishing equipment and hiking boots and things like that. I live in Evergreen. Because my wife works in Denver, and I drive up four or five days a week on Interstate 70, so I have several interests in what's going on with I-70.</p> <p>I'd like to say that, if some sort of mass transit is put in place, I would take it every day on my commute, and I would pay for it gladly to get my car off the interstate along with other people's cars.</p> <p>Mr. Espinoza asked the question: Would you like to see more people in Summit County? As a non-developer, I think that more people are going to come to Summit County, and so we really don't have a choice. What we need to do is figure out how we can mitigate that reality. If you ask the question, would I like to see more cars in Summit County, the answer is absolutely not. We have plenty of cars coming up the interstate as it is.</p> <p>And I do have some concerns with the preferred alternative that would only widen the existing pavement and not involve some of these other alternatives. First of all, we are almost out of parking space in Summit County and Vail and probably some of the other communities as well. We're getting to the point where we can't accept any more cars without a lot more expansion or pavement in those mountain communities.</p> <p>Obviously, the issue of pollution concerns me. More air pollution and more noise pollution are things that -- that as a nonresident I don't want to see.</p> <p>And I'm also concerned that if we spend 15 to 20 years improving I-70's capacity to carry more cars, in 15 years we're going to be right back in this room talking about the same thing, that there's not enough room to move all these cars into the mountains. What I would like to see is added passing lanes, restrictions of commercial trucks during peak times, and one of the mass transit alternatives other than diesel buses.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	422	Kalan, Thomas	Public	2/26/2005	<p>I attended the February 26th meeting at the Vintage Hotel at the Base of the Winter Park ski area. The meeting was well documented with wall displays. We had a chance to speak to several representatives, but could not attend the entire meeting. Thank you for your time.</p> <p>I have the following comments to make:</p> <p>All of the present efforts are focused on the I-70 corridor. The interstate highway certainly needs attention in the immediate future to alleviate the heavy traffic on weekends and projected traffic in the future. I question, however, if it is wise to channel all the anticipated future traffic through the same corridor. Obviously we can widen and improve the road to handle traffic faster, but we are putting through more and more vehicles, adversely impacting communities along the way, increasing pollution and additionally damaging the environment.</p> <p>Rather than focusing traffic into one area, we should aim at dispersing and lessening the amount of traffic through available corridors.</p> <p>I would urge you to seriously consider opening in the future an additional corridor through the mountains, in particular a tunnel due west of Boulder connecting to existing US highway 40 at Tabernash. From there motorists could visit Sol Vista, Winter Park/Mary Jane, continue west on Hwy 40 to Steamboat Springs. Hwy 40 is now underutilized and new traffic would benefit the communities along the way. The new corridor would serve particularly well northern Denver and cities along the Front Range north of Denver.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	475	Kalitowski, Mark	Public	1/11/2005	<p>It has always seemed a waste to gain all that altitude heading out of Denver and then lose most of it to drop back down to Clear Creek. Has any study been done to see what it would take to stay on the hillside and traverse to somewhere just west of Idaho Springs? It would be shorter and substantially safer than the current alignment.</p> <p>Considering what you did in Glenwood Canyon, I would think the engineering is feasible and perhaps the costs are not out of reach. And, you would only disrupt I-70 traffic where and when you connect the ends.</p>	Online

Categorized Comment	362	Katt, Ken	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Hi. First, before I get started, I got to let you know something. Some people enjoy getting up talking to you all. I don't. I absolutely hate this. But as much as I hate doing this, I hate the idea of this even more. And this looks like the way we're going to go unless you get involved and we're all on the same page on how we're going to defeat this. This is not the answer. I think everyone in here knows that. Well, there might be a few -- sorry.</p> <p>See that? I don't want this. I don't want this. This is what I fight against. That's why I'm getting up here; because as much as I hate doing this, I hate this more.</p> <p>Hi. My name is Ken Katt. I don't know if you got that. I'm a private citizen. And the reason I'm getting involved in this is because ten years ago I used to drive up to Breckenridge on a Sunday afternoon, and there's a lot of hell going on up there. And for those of you who get up here and say, consider me, consider this, I tell you what, why don't you go spend a weekend up in Clear Creek County as a resident up there for a weekend and come back and think you've got it bad. You don't. Clear Creek County residents have got it bad.</p> <p>Anyway, on the -- if you refer to the executive summary, page 50, you will see in there -- I will paraphrase it, that the final alternative which is chosen may be a hybrid of all the alternatives being discussed. In other words, we don't need to accept any one of the nine alternatives as is. We can mix and match. We can take the best of the best and omit the rest.</p> <p>I'm going to come out with a new hybrid, which hopefully will be considered, because one of the options which is being considered is build a highway and preserve for some sort of mass transit. But it's always build highway this, build highway that, preserve for this, preserve for that. I'm saying let's build an elevated guideway for buses. You will be building -- as we do so, we will be building a superstructure which could be upgraded later for a more modern version such as the AGS monorail.</p> <p>But you are building a superstructure, and here's why we want to do it that way: Because when the announcement is made on what the preferred alternative is, they will be talking about and employing all those wonderful citizens who have been involved in the AGS, the monorail. But we need to do something currently. The current situation could very well involve having highway. I do not want a highway.</p> <p>So if you want to solve -- you want to address current needs, we need to address current needs in a way you can live with. It's not the highway folks. Let's do the bus in guideway. Let's elevate it to minimize the traffic disruptions and minimize the impact on the environment.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	339	Katt, Ken	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Okay. On the executive summary, page 50, lower left-hand corner, it says: The preferred alternative may become a hybrid of the alternatives examined in this PEIS as a result of public comment. So I think it's interesting to note that we don't really have to accept any one of these nine alternatives as presented to us. We can kind of pick and choose from the best aspects of each and every one while keeping some of the worst aspects out of the final equation.</p> <p>I think the best solution is one where we build an elevated guideway for buses now while preserving the option of upgrading that superstructure later to accommodate AGS or monorail technology. So what that does is it addresses a current need while investing in a possible alternative for Colorado's future if the money becomes available and the technology can be proven to be consistently reliable, in the type of environment that will find itself in the I-70 mountain corridor. That's it for now.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	374	Katt, Ken	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Just a comment for CDOT and you all. You extended the public comment period for an additional number of days, but you did not, in fact, extend the period for public presentation. I know it's not the most enjoyable part of your job, but it would be nice if you could, in fact, have another public meeting a little bit later during the time for -- that's still open for review.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	287	Katt, Ken	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Ken Katt. One thing that needs to be revisited is the number one best option is the reversible guideway option, and that was eliminated because they're talking about schedule dependability. Down in Denver, where I live, they have to deal everyday with schedule dependability and if they're late, if they miss their bus connection, because a bus has been delayed in traffic and they're late to their job.</p> <p>If we can deal with it down in Denver, the schedule dependability aspect, you can deal with it up here. That is not a good reason to eliminate the number one best option available. And I'd like to debate anyone on that. And that's pretty much all I have. But that needs to be said -- that they eliminated the reversible guideway because of schedule dependability, basically because on a Sunday afternoon when all the traffic is backed up and they're worried about a bus which is westbound getting to Silverthorne on time. It's a concern, yes; not a big concern.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	302	Katt, Ken	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Hi. My name is Ken Katt. I'm a resident of southeast Denver.</p> <p>I really don't travel in the mountains at a time that the congestion affects me, and anything that happens out there is really not going to have much of a negative effect on me. So why am I here? Because I'm not affiliated with any organization, I'm speaking on my own behalf. It's because 10 years ago I used to live in Breckenridge, and I'd go to Denver on the weekends and I'd come back westbound on Sunday afternoon, and I saw the hell you went through. I felt really bad for the people on the highway, felt really bad for the residents of Idaho Springs, Dumont, Downieville, Lawson -- cars speeding in the back roads. You go through hell. Well, I'm on your side.</p> <p>We might be reading the same chapter, but I don't think we're on the same page. Now, you've heard the saying united we stand, divided we fall -- or divided we fall, let's change that a little bit.</p> <p>Let me get my prop. United they stand, Governor Bill Owens, Tom Norton, the oil and gas industry, concrete and asphalt paving companies. What do they want to give you? They want to give you the highway. That's what they want, and they're speaking loud and clear. And if you want the highway expansion, you don't got to do a damn thing, because look who you've got on your side.</p> <p>Now, this is what they're hearing from us. We are all over the place. We don't need to stay divided. We need to get united on a horse that can win the race against these interests here. What is it? I mean, right now, we're hearing carpool, bike paths, we're hearing everything. I'm here to support bus in guideway. I know a lot of people here support the mag lev, the AGS. I don't, because everything that can be done with the AGS can be done better, cheaper, with more flexibility and better liability with the bus in guideway.</p> <p>But the thing is, I'm saying I want a steak, which is bus in guideway. CDOT right now is saying -- or seems to be saying, if you want a steak, you have to have it well done. I say, No. I want a steak, I want it medium rare. I want to elevate it. I want to do some things which will mitigate the cause of traffic, control congestion, what have you.</p> <p>Let me give you an idea of the comparisons between AGS in the median and bus in guideway. With one and a quarter billion dollars, I can spend money necessary on minimal action components. I can give you the six miles of eastbound guideway from Silverthorne up to the tunnel. We don't need to drill through the tunnel. I can also give you the six-mile section there, give you 13 miles of reversible from Empire Junction to the Hidden Valley interchange. That would become immediately effective. And I'd have \$370 million left over from the 1.6 billion which has already been committed.</p> <p>With that same 1.23 billion or one and a quarter billion, AGS will get you from C-470 to the US 6 interchange. With the 1.6 billion that has already been committed, I'll give you the six-mile guideway eastbound from Silverthorne to the tunnel and 24 miles of reversible guideway from the Empire Junction to the Genesee interchange. Once again, immediately effective. The AGS, the 1.6 billion which has already been committed, will get you from C-470 to the Dumont interchange. How many people are going to ride that?</p> <p>With \$4 billion, which is what the cap is right now, AGS will get you from C-470 to Copper Mountain. This is great if that's your final destination or if you own real estate there. \$4 billion spent on the bus in guideway, I'll give you a six-mile segment from Silverthorne to the Eisenhower Tunnel. I'll give you a 30-mile reversible guideway from the tunnel to Hidden Valley interchange. I'll give you a 17-mile bi-directional guideway from Hidden Valley to C-470, and I still have 100 -- I'm sorry -- \$1.5 billion left over.</p> <p>Now, we've always been taught to think big.</p> <p>Let's do think big, B-I-G, bus in guideway.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	259	Katt, Ken	Public	2/2/2005	<p>I'm not as well spoken as the previous speaker, but before I get started, can I say some thanks to some people? Because I've worked with JF Sato. Michelle helped me out a lot. CDOT's really lucky to have JF Sato working for you. They've done a great job. Teresa O'Neil put up with me. Andrew Holten, I think I turned a few of his hairs gray, and Shaun Han, they've all been very helpful.</p> <p>Anyway, I have submitted something in writing to the court reporter. I'll just kind of read it to you and do some extemporaneous thinking. Basically, I've broken it down into highway alternatives, AGS alternatives, and then the bus in guideway alternatives. And I definitely support the bus in guideway</p>	Transcripts



alternatives.

Number one -- I'll get started -- highway alternatives. The only thing we will accomplish by choosing one of these options, even the reversible-lane option, is to encourage more of the same. We already have cars traveling through our mountains, and if we do not provide a sensible alternative, it will only get worse.

In fact, even if we had enough money in the room to widen the highway to eight lanes, all that does is cause congestion in other places. Imagine the additional congestion in Silverthorne, Dillon, Frisco, Vail, and Avon. Imagine trying to take Highway 9 from Silverthorne north to Kremmling, or from Frisco south to Breckenridge. All you're going to get is a lot more congestion. In short, more of the same is insane. And what we need is a viable transit alternative.

Which brings us to the AGS or rail alternatives. Even if we had the money available to provide one of these alternatives, which we don't, neither one of them provide a viable transit alternative.

I'll admit that the AGS alternative sounds pie-in-the-sky wonderful, but so did the United baggage system at DIA, and look how that worked out, it never worked worth a damn. That baggage system was kindergarten material compared to the AGS.

However, even if we had the money to do it and we could prove that it was workable, it makes no sense. Why? Number one, because it would be only minimally functional until it was 100 percent complete. In other words, you pretty much have to complete the construction from one terminus to the other before commuters could use it effectively.

Number two, because you have to provide a return track in the other direction. In other words, since an AGS train can only travel on a special track, we'd have to provide a way for those trains to return to the other terminus even if there is no demand by commuters to do so at that time. Therefore, you've made a significant extra cost to provide excess capacity in a direction that is not needed at that time.

Third, because even if we had the money, didn't mind spending foolishly on unnecessary excess capacity on something that wouldn't be functional for a long time, one small glitch, just one small glitch in that system shuts the whole thing down and nobody can go nowhere until it's fixed. It's a multibillion boondoggle. In fact, I think we've seen that in the light-rail. We had a situation where the electrical grid went down and nobody went anywhere on that thing until it got fixed.

So the bus in guideway alternatives, that's what I prefer. These alternatives offer the best solutions for the I-70 corridor. However, in my opinion, the diesel option -- the diesel bus option is better.

There's two. There's dual mode, which combines electricity with a diesel bus. Diesel bus option offers all the advantages of the AGS alternative at a fraction of the cost with more flexibility and would be functional without being 100 percent complete. Even at an unnecessarily inflated cost of three and a quarter billion, this alternative offers one of the best options in regard to cost-benefit analysis. And that's inflated because I don't think you'd have to spend \$450 million drilling a third bore through the Eisenhower Tunnel. I don't think we have to make the guideway bi-directional between the eastern portal and C-470.

It's also the least detrimental to the environment. You can make it even less detrimental to the environment -- and basically, you can complete the segments -- and as you complete segments, it becomes effective. Just imagine scurrying the upbound traffic up the Eisenhower Tunnel from Silverthorne on a Sunday afternoon. The bus skirts right by them. Same thing with the Eisenhower Tunnel.

And I read slow. I'm sorry. But if anybody wants this, I put this in to the court reporter. And you can get an extra copy from me, if you like.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	664	Katt, Ken	Public	5/24/2005	The I-70 Mountain Corridor	Email
---------------------	-----	-----------	--------	-----------	----------------------------	-------

Quotation #1

"If the only tool you have is a hammer, you tend to view every problem as if it's a nail"

Quotation #2

"Insanity is doing the same thing over and over again while expecting different results"

I don't know who deserves credit for the above quotations, but I'm sure they must have had in mind all those people who believe that whole scale highway widening offers the best solution for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. These people are wrong, they are shortsighted, and they very probably are motivated by something other than trying to find the best solution for the corridor.

The only thing we accomplish by whole scale widening of I-70 through the mountain corridor is to encourage more people to drive their private autos, flooding mountain towns with even more cars where congestion is already a problem and parking spaces are considered to be a premium commodity. Additionally, if we widen I-70, it won't be much longer before we need to start spending money to widen US 40 into Winter Park, Highway 9 north from Silverthorne into Kremmling and south from Frisco into Breckenridge, and so on and so on. If we then factor in the resulting increase in air pollution from auto emissions and airborne particulates, consider the excessive amounts of fuel we will be wasting, and realize that we are doing absolutely nothing that truly improves the situation for the long term, I think we have sufficient reason to question the mentality and/or motivation of those who believe we should seriously consider any of the so-called "highway" alternatives as the best solution for the corridor.

What we need to do is select a sensible alternative that can be implemented quickly to mitigate current congestion problems, while being flexible enough to address future travel volumes. We need to select an alternative that is as sensitive as possible to the environment, wildlife and historic properties throughout the corridor. We need to select an alternative that considers the concerns of the mountain communities, both inside and outside the corridor, in an appropriate fashion. Finally, we need to select an alternative that not only accomplishes all of the above, but does so with necessary budget constraints in mind, offering us the "biggest bang for the buck". I'm confident in assuming that this is what every reasonable-minded person wants.

Unfortunately, none of the alternatives currently under study comes close to accomplishing all of the above on an "as is" basis. Fortunately, as is stated on page 50 of the Executive Summary under the heading "Next Steps for Tier 1 PEIS"... "The preferred alternative may become a hybrid of the alternatives examined in this PEIS as a result of public comment"... It is with this in mind that I am offering what I feel is the best solution for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. I think it would be best to refer to my proposal as Transit Alternative 1a.

Transit Alternative 1a

I refer to my proposal as Transit Alternative 1a because although it utilizes a bus-in-guideway approach, it does not do so in the same manner that has been presented to us in the PEIS. In fact, since most people seem to believe that we need to accept the alternatives presented in the PEIS on an "as is" basis, the way both of the bus-in-guideway alternatives have been presented is probably the biggest reason why we haven't had a larger outpouring of support for the basic concept. I also refer to it as Transit Alternative 1a because it involves paying for more of the Minimal Action Components as outlined under the Minimal Action Alternative. One of these is the \$245 million for curve safety in Dowd Canyon, an item which is not included under any of the Transit Alternatives, but which should be since it addresses a safety issue. Also, it includes some of the elements included under "Buses in Mixed Traffic".

In order to better understand what I am proposing, it might be best to first explain where I am in disagreement with the PEIS. Here is where I disagree:

1) The PEIS asserts that a third bore at the Eisenhower Tunnels is necessary. That might be true for all of the other alternatives, but is not true for a bus-in-guideway approach. In fact, one of the key attributes that make this concept so appealing is the ability to travel where no guideway exists. Obviously then, we will have the guideway end just short of the E/JMT portal and the buses will then merge with or in front of highway traffic and continue traveling through one of the existing tunnel bores. Since it costs \$450 million to drill a third bore, this is money that we can much better spend elsewhere.

2) The PEIS suggests a ground-level guideway. However, an elevated guideway is much better. Not only does an elevated guideway offer greater flexibility, it is also less harmful to the environment, less detrimental to wildlife, easier and less time-consuming to build, and makes the task of snow removal much simpler. Also, since an elevated guideway can be built in a way that does not require altering the existing highway, traffic delays due to construction are minimized. And, on top of everything else, it is actually less expensive to build an elevated guideway !!

3) The PEIS suggests that we should build a guideway the entire 55 miles from Silverthorne to C-470. Once again, the reason this is not necessary is because these buses are able to travel where no guideway exists. Initially, we will only want to build a guideway where the traffic congestion is of a predictable, systemic nature. As systemic congestion occurs in other areas, we can build guideway there at that time to alleviate the situation. The idea is simply to remove these buses from the congested stream of traffic, where a bus only exacerbates the problem, and put it on a separate track. This not only improves travel times for bus passengers, it also improves the flow of traffic on the highway, a definite win-win solution.

4) The PEIS suggests either a dual-mode or diesel bus. We should rule out the dual-mode bus right

away due to its poor performance when traveling outside the guideway. Also, the diesel bus needs to be configured differently in order to benefit ridership numbers and garner community acceptance and approval. Let's be honest, one of the biggest reasons why people don't strongly support the bus-in-guideway approach is because it has an image problem. In fact, there tends to be somewhat of a stigma attached to riding the bus. Therefore, we should not be talking about using the 60-seat, black-like, diesel-belching behemoths that are commonly used by Greyhound and/or RTD. Instead, we should be looking at a smaller bus that incorporates a streamlined, modernistic design. It should have tinted, curved windows that provide a "vista-dome" view. We need to understand that the passengers on these buses will be traveling through some of the most beautiful scenery in the world and we need to do what we can to help them enjoy it. In other words, even though we want the bus-in-guideway concept to improve travel times for its passengers above and beyond what they would experience in a private auto, we almost need to make getting from point A to B incidental to the experience. Isn't that the reason why so many people enjoy taking the Ski-Train to Winter Park? Also, won't the citizens of our mountain communities appreciate an attractive addition to their streets as opposed to what some might consider a stinky eyesore?

Now that I've explained where I disagree with the PEIS and why, I need to include a little more information before getting into the specifics of my proposal.

Since the PEIS considers only a ground-level guideway, not an elevated one, it was necessary to obtain relevant information from an outside source. Although I am confident that this outside source is credible and that I received accurate information, I know you'll have to do your own research on this. If you would like to contact him, here is the source I used:

Dale Hill  
Mobile Energy Solutions  
Dalehill4mes@AOL.com  
720-635-6681 (cell)

Although I can talk about some of Mr. Hill's credentials, I figured it would be best for him to cover that for you.

Here is what I learned from Mr. Hill:

A good estimate for building an elevated bus guideway would be around \$25 million per mile. This figure represents a quick, rough-guess estimate based on a previous project Mr. Hill was involved with a few years back and factoring in today's increased price of tubular steel and labor. Most of the work could be done at night and would involve installing prefabricated sections. The amount of time needed to erect 6 miles of guideway would be around 4 months. Obviously, there are many variables involved and this information was provided to me without the benefit of a site-specific study or lengthy calculations by Mr. Hill.

Some of the details of what I am proposing for Transit Alternative 1a are based on the fact that, at this time, eastbound Sunday afternoon traffic is when congestion is the worst. Therefore, I think it is more important (initially) that we focus on how we get Front Range travelers back to their homes efficiently than it is to get them into the mountains efficiently. In fact, if we can demonstrate that they will be getting back home on Sunday afternoon in a more efficient and enjoyable manner by using our bus-in-guideway approach than they can in a private auto, that will help guide their future decisions on how they get into the mountains in the first place.

Transit Alternative 1a – (\$1.3 Billion)

We spend \$530 million to pay for all of the Minimal Action Components included in each of the Transit Alternatives and add the \$245 million needed for curve safety in Dowd Canyon. An additional \$150 million for a 6-mile segment of guideway from Silverthorne to the EJMT and \$325 million for a 13-mile segment from Empire Junction to the Hidden Valley Interchange. We still have \$50 million left for other items.

Transit Alternative 1a – (\$1.6 Billion)

We pay for all of the items outlined in the \$1.3 billion option, but instead of a 13-mile segment of guideway from Empire Junction to Hidden Valley, we now construct a 24-mile segment from Empire Junction to the Genesee Interchange. We still have \$75 million left for other items.

Transit Alternative 1a – (\$2.4 Billion)

We pay for all of the items outlined in the \$1.6 billion option, but instead of a 24-mile segment of guideway from Empire Junction to the Genesee Interchange, we now are able to construct a 45-mile segment of guideway from the EJMT to C-470, as well as a 10-mile segment from East Vail to the top of Vail Pass. We still have \$100 million left for other items.

Final Notes:

The guideway should be designed in a way that would allow its conversion and/or retrofitting to a more advanced technology at a later date, if deemed feasible.

In all of the options above, it is necessary to prioritize and to mitigate the most serious pinch points first. That would probably require constructing the segments of guideway as indicated in the \$1.3 billion option first, implementing the Minimal Action Components second, and adding any additional guideway after that.

Obviously, since all of the above options are based on a rough-guess estimate of \$25 million per mile of elevated guideway, actual costs will vary.

Categorized Comment	809	Katt, Ken	Public	2/2/2005	I-70 MOUNTAIN CORRIDOR OPTIONS	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
					<p>The Highway Alternatives</p> <p>The only thing we will accomplish by choosing one of these options, even the somewhat appealing "reversible lane" option, is to encourage more of the same. We already have enough cars traveling through our mountains and if we do not provide a sensible alternative, it will only get worse. In fact, even if we had enough money and room to widen the highway to 8 lanes, all that does is cause congestion in other places. Imagine the additional congestion in Silverthorne, Dillon, Frisco, Vail and Avon. Imagine trying to take Hwy. 9 from Silverthorne north to Kremmling or from Frisco south to Breckenridge. . . Congestion!!</p> <p>In short, more of the same is insane and what we need is a viable transit alternative.</p> <p>AGS (or Rail) Alternatives</p> <p>Even if we had the money available to provide one of these alternatives, neither one of them provides a viable transit alternative. I'll admit that the AGS alternative sounds "pie-in-the-sky" wonderful, but so did the United baggage system at DIA. Look how that worked out. Never worked worth a damn. That baggage system was kindergarten material compared to the AGS. However, even if we had the money to do it and we could prove that it was workable, it makes no sense. Why...?</p> <p>Because it would only be minimally functional until it was 100% complete. In other words, you'd pretty much have to complete its construction from one terminus to the other before commuters could use it effectively.</p> <p>Because you have to provide a return track in the other direction. In other words, since an AGS train can only travel on a special track, you have to provide a way for those trains to return to the other terminus, even if there is no demand by commuters to do so at that time. Therefore, you've paid a significant extra cost to provide excess capacity in a direction that is not needed at that time.</p> <p>Because even if we had the money, didn't mind spending it foolishly on unneeded excess capacity on something that wouldn't be functional for a long time, one small "glitch" in the system shuts the whole thing down and ain't nobody gonna go nowhere till it's fixed!! Quite simply, a multi-billion dollar boondoggle!</p>	
					<p>Bus in Guideway Alternatives</p> <p>These alternatives offer the best solutions available for the I-70 Corridor. However, in my opinion, the diesel bus option is better.</p> <p>This alternative offers all the advantages of the AGS alternative at a fraction of the cost, with more flexibility, and would be functional without being 100% complete.</p> <p>Even at an unnecessarily inflated cost of \$3.26 billion, this alternative offers one of the best options in regard to a cost/benefit analysis. Since it is necessary to drill a third bore through two and a half miles of solid rock under the continental divide with this option, we save \$450 million by not doing so. Since it is not necessary to have bi-directional guideways from C-470 to the EJMT tunnels, but only a single reversible guideway, additional millions are saved. This means that the cost/benefit analysis for this alternative gets even better.</p> <p>As designed, this alternative is one of the least detrimental to the environment. With a few modifications to its design, it can become even less detrimental. This would involve moving the guideway outside of the median in some places and using an elevated support system in others. Using an elevated support system would also reduce the problems associated with snow removal. Additionally, a single reversible</p>	

Categorized Comment	390	Katz, J.B.	Municipalities	2/23/2005	<p>guideway, which has been elevated onto supporting piers, can be designed in such a way as to minimize the impact on Idaho Springs residents, particularly in regard to the 13th Avenue overpass. It can also minimize the construction delays, which would normally be associated with its construction at ground level in the median in other areas of the corridor.</p> <p>Additionally, unlike with the AGS, this alternative offers benefits when only short segments are completed. Imagine a short 6-mile segment being completed for eastbound buses between Silverthorne and the west portal of the EJMT. Imagine another short 13-mile reversible segment being completed between the Heavenly Valley interchange and Georgetown. Once completed, these segments would offer immediate benefits. At an approximate (estimated) cost of \$30 million per mile, these 2 short segments would cost \$600 million and an additional billion dollars would still be left from the \$1.6 billion already committed to the corridor.</p> <p>Hi. How are you? I'm J.B. Katz. I'm mayor pro tem of the Breckenridge Town Council. I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight. And I speak to you tonight on behalf of the Breckenridge Town Council.</p> <p>We need a solution to the I-70 chokepoints today. The economy of the Western Slope is already impacted by those chokepoints, and it can't wait any longer. Of the alternatives that have been proposed so far, the town of Breckenridge strongly supports the three lanes in either direction with the preserved center right-of-way for transit, but six-laning must come first.</p> <p>I-70 is a major commercial thoroughfare for Colorado and the country. The habits of our visitors and the toys that they travel with, combined with the tire traffic that uses I-70 for commerce simply make transit unviable as a first option. No one likes a road project while it's going on. It's a bitter pill to swallow for sure.</p> <p>But after observing how CDOT managed T-Rex, we are very confident that CDOT will do everything it can to effectively manage the project, move it along as quickly as possible, and minimize the effects to all involved. Every day that we wait, the problem just gets worse and the solution is going to be tougher to deal with.</p> <p>We're sensitive to the concerns of Clear Creek County, but six-laning of I-70 cannot wait. Our visitors have easy choices to make, and it won't be long before congestion drives them elsewhere like Salt Lake City and the ski areas of Utah. The potential impact to the economy of the Western Slope and the state as a whole is life-threatening.</p> <p>Finally, I'd just like to say that transit will extend the life of six-laning because eventually that's not going to be enough either, but it's not going to solve the problems in the short term either.</p> <p>Thanks for your time.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	625	Kaup, Shelley	Public	5/25/2005	<p>5/24/05 11:10 pm: The report approaches the I-70 corridor from the narrow standpoint of moving the traffic along the route. As a resident of Glenwood Springs and frequent visitor to Summit county, I am most concerned with quality of life in the mountain cities and surrounding areas. The decision that is made for transportation along this corridor will have profound impacts on all of the mountain towns. Moving vehicles more efficiently along the corridor may seem like a worthy goal, but what are the towns supposed to do with all the vehicles when they get here? If I-70 is expanded to 6 lanes the traffic counts will grow not only on the highway, but on every connecting highway and main street. Towns and cities will be impacted by increased vehicles throughout the town, loss of safety to residents, needs for more parking, increases in noise and lower air quality. Many of these towns are in narrow valleys that simply do not have the space to handle the traffic that will be induced by widening the highway. In addition has CDOT projected the increased costs of widening all the roadways impacted by I-70? How would the life of surrounding highways be extended by increased transit in the mountains?</p> <p>Alternatives to single vehicle travel is lacking along I-70. If the state developed reliable transit alternatives along this route, the communities could develop feeder systems and the capacity to move goods and people throughout the mountains would be greatly enhanced with fewer of the impacts of huge increases in private vehicles. This could help to guide smarter growth and preserve the beautiful resources of our state that attract visitors here. It would also provide a safer travel alternative for visitors.</p> <p>I believe that this study greatly underestimates the % of people that would use a reliable safe transit alternative. Especially for commuter travel and resort destination travel along the narrow mountain corridors. I have read about the gross underestimate of the ridership for the Light rail line which operates on Sante Fe in Denver. Apparently the 2015 ridership estimates were exceeded within the first couple of years that it opened. Increased prices of gasoline will also lead more people to seek a transit alternative. Please do not repeat that along I-70. If you build it people will ride.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	626	Kaup, Shelley	Public	5/25/2005	<p>Both these comments were submitted late night on 5/24/05. I hope you will accept them. Thank you.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	623	Kaup, Shelley	Public	5/25/2005	<p>Safety concerns; Chart ES-19. The way that fatal accident rates are compared is manipulated to downplay the high accident rate of private vehicle riders versus transit riders. By graphing percentages in this way, the graph downplays the safety of transit riders. Why not graph the real numbers? Separate out transit from private vehicle riders (and trucks). Show the numbers of fatalities expected each year for private vehicle drivers vs. transit riders for each alternative. This would provide users of the highway with a true representation of the safety of the travel alternatives.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	710	Keating, Chris	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>If we widen the highway, what are we going to do with all the cars?</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	516	Keller, Peech	Public	2/23/2005	<p>I commute daily between Idaho Springs and Dillon. The weekday traffic, even during ski season, is not heavy nor is it slow except for the occasional accident. I see this entire proposal as a benefit to only the weekend drivers during summer and ski season, the vast majority of whom are recreating. I can't support spending taxpayer dollars of this magnitude to serve people on vacation. I am extremely concerned about the short and long-term impacts on Clear Creek County residents - their commutes, their businesses, and their property values during construction. I would like to see proposals to mitigate these negative impacts on the local community. Those of us who live off Fall River Rd have no choice but to get on I-70 to go anywhere. Build a bridge across Clear Creek to allow us to bypass construction. Post hours of construction so we can choose to avoid them on our way to work. But most of all, choose no action or public transportation. Adding lanes will only change people's behavior. Those who now choose not to drive I-70 during those peak times will likely take to the road, creating more congestion and ultimately result in the same gridlock except 3-lanes worth as opposed to 2. Not worth the money nor the pain.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	559	Kellermann, Alison	Public	5/23/2005	<p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation- Section 1 18500 East Cofax Ave Aurora, Co 80011</p> <p>May 20, 2005</p> <p>RE: I-70 Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Cecelia,</p> <p>These comments are submitted by the Town of Breckenridge in accordance with the Colorado Department of Transportation's notice of the I-70 Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.</p> <p>The Town of Breckenridge is a member of the I-70 Coalition, has actively participated in that coalition, and supports the coalition's comments on the PEIS. Those comments include the view that interchange improvements are a priority and that interchange improvements necessarily involve associated highway improvements.</p> <p>We write this letter to highlight more specifically the priority of certain interchange improvements. One interchange, which is crucial in the I-70 corridor is Empire Junction, where Highway 40 intersects I-70. Highway 40 is a significant contributor to the I-70 capacity particularly at those peak traffic weekend times in winter and summer. Given that the I-70 area immediately east of Idaho Springs is a recognized pinch point and should be a priority for I-70 improvement and given that the Highway 40 intersection at Empire Junction is as well a priority improvement, what steps will CDOT take to ensure that section of I-70 between these two improvements will not become an obvious bottleneck?</p>	Online

Sincerely,

Ernie Blake  
Mayor of Breckenridge

Cc: I-70 Coalition

Categorized Comment	342	Kelson, Elizabeth	Public	3/17/2005	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>Thank you providing the opportunity to comment on the PEIS for the I-70 Corridor both on-line and thru the Public meetings held throughout the mountain communities. Many citizens have made comments and I believe that everything should be done to address their concerns, since they feel that you are PLOWING thru their homes.</p> <p>Citizens can speak for themselves. However, the real natives...the wildlife that tourists often come to Colorado to see...have not had a voice. Please add to your designs more wildlife crossings so that their free movements are less impeded by roads. Something as simple as an appropriate culvert may have saved the life of our first wolf in decades as well as saving the lives of people striking elk and deer in the roadway. I know it costs money, but it is a small price to pay if SAFETY is one of the main issues of the roadways.</p> <p>Thank you for your time</p> <p>elizabeth kelson 29304 lee rd evergreen co</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	700	Kemp, Amy	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	590	Keneson, Brooke	Public	5/24/2005	<p>My opinion!</p> <p>I think that the best thing right now would be to just keep I-70 the same. I think this because it would stop the fighting and the debating and the people in the mountains would be much happier. Because if you keep it the same it will keep historical marks, protect wildlife as well.</p> <p>One example would be the paleontological resources that one of the examples for the historical sites. Paleontological are mostly dinosaur bones and fossils that have a lot of research. There are still a lot left in the mountains as well as in our very own backyards. There three segments of high sensitivity. In addition, there are federal laws about it one example would be The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. That's just one of the reasons why they should just keep it the same.</p> <p>Another example would be to protect wildlife more. Like the animals, homes all the animals living there could be destroyed from construction like in the trees and on the ground as well as under the ground animals could get dug up. The animals are also used to the way life is now. That is one more reason that I think they should not build anything.</p> <p>One last example would be the people living in the mountains. The people living in Idaho springs we were up there and most people don't want them to build anything. We experienced being and working there. I would not want to live next an even bigger highway no highway as it is! Would you want more people and traffic in your backyard and where you live. Overall I wouldn't want to live there.</p> <p>All in all I wouldn't want to do anything just leave it the same. The scientists would not want to do anything that would destroy paleontological resources. If the animals could speak they would be protesting. The last thing would be the people im surprised they are not protesting!</p> <p>All in all that's my opinion, that is about all of my opinions I have for you. Hopefully you make the right choices!!!</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	293	Kennedy, Carolyn	Public	2/9/2005	<p>My name is Carolyn Kennedy. I live in Idaho Springs.</p> <p>I kind of am reiterating what Bob just said about the alternative route, which seems to make a lot of sense. So we don't have every single car that's headed west having to go over I-70. There should be an alternative route so if something happens like the boulder in Glenwood Canyon, people have a reasonable way to get home or get around it without having to go so far out of their way on bad roads. The road into Breckenridge off of 285 looks very reasonable to me.</p> <p>And I just think that should be done first. That would relieve a lot of the pressure on I-70 when, ultimately, they do whatever widening or work needs to be done. And that would give people an alternate to travel west to the Western Slope or travel east and west besides all the 10 years of construction through Idaho Springs.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	209	Kennedy, Carolyn	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Thank you for listening - I hope you really did. I fear that the decision is made and is being influenced by money - not just the project cost but by those who want traffic on I-70 only.</p> <p>As was suggested several times at this meeting, east-west alternatives to I-70 are necessary - to spread out traffic rather than continuing to funnel and concentrate it on I-70 - and these would also help development in areas of Colorado other than the front range and the I-70 corridor. Please consider this. I have no idea of cost of these, in the long range the benefits to the state would be priceless.</p> <p>Idaho Springs resident and business owner - struggling</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	666	Kenney, John and KD	Public	5/24/2005	<p>To: David Nicol</p> <p>Dear FHWA (Mr. Nicol)</p> <p>I tried to fax my comments to CDOT but couldn't find their fax number on the website.</p> <p>PLEASE do not allow 6-lane highway. It's not needed and won't be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- any easier for CDOT to maintain (they are already having as it is)</li> <li>- any easier on the wildlife or environment - no matter what they pay the consultants to say (there are hundreds of deer, etc., accidents already)</li> <li>- any safer for motorists (people drive faster and crazier with wider lanes and too crazy as it is)</li> </ul> <p>PLEASE be progressive and think outside of the highway box. PLEASE! for all of our futures...</p> <p>Also, could you please ask CDOT/Mr. Norton to do the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Make their next EIS more public friendly - the tiny font and reams of paper made it extremely difficult to get through.</li> <li>2. Please ask CDOT to brush up on the meaning behind the National Environmental Policy Act. Last I heard, it was aimed at making it easy for the public to understand/participate. (No fax number, difficult to read reports.) Also the attitude of Mr. Norton throughout this process has been very upsetting - presuming he knows the answer (as he stated in the February Trans. Commission meeting) and not appearing to give one care to someone who doesn't share his "answer." I didn't think the answer was supposed to be "predetermined"! Thank you.</li> </ol>	Written
Categorized Comment	589	Colorado Wildlife Federation	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	<p>Colorado Wildlife Federation 4045 Wadsworth Boulevard, Suite 20 Wheat Ridge, CO 80033</p> <p>May 23, 2005</p> <p>Ms. Cecelia Joy, Project Manager</p>	Online

Ms. Chris Paulsen, Deputy Project Manager  
Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1  
18500 East Colfax Avenue  
Aurora, CO 80011

Re: I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Ms. Joy and Ms. Paulsen:

The Colorado Wildlife Federation (CWF) was founded in 1953, as an affiliate of National Wildlife Federation, and is dedicated to conserving Colorado's natural resources and wildlife heritage, including fishing, hunting and wildlife viewing. On behalf of our thousands of members that are concerned about the future of fish and wildlife in the state of Colorado, please accept these formal comments on the Interstate Highway 70 Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). We appreciate the opportunity to comment, and hope that the following comments will assist the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) in incorporating the most effective fish and wildlife conservation measures into the decision about I-70 Mountain Corridor.

We are encouraged that CDOT has incorporated design elements that will begin to mitigate impacts to wildlife. We believe the I-70 corridor presents a major barrier to the movement of wildlife. Further we believe that the initial cost of these mitigation measures will not only protect wildlife, but also will improve safety and reduce property damage in the long term.

We appreciate the fact that the Draft PEIS recognizes that I-70 is a barrier:

"Interference with wildlife movement due to the barrier effects created by I-70 and the influences of alternatives is considered to be one of the most serious issues affecting wildlife in the Corridor (p. 3.2-1)."

However, we believe that this statement could be further supported with additional scientific information on the fact that roads fragment wildlife habitat. Inclusion of this material would provide the CDOT additional data to aid in decision-making. Habitat fragmentation is now recognized as one of the greatest threats to biodiversity and the decline of species worldwide (Ehrlich 1986; Wicove et al. 1998) – a trend expected only to increase across the Southern Rockies as the population of the region continues to grow. Transportation infrastructure, in particular, is a significant cause of habitat fragmentation, with negative impacts on wildlife (e.g., Harris and Gallagher 1989; Maehr 1994; Reed et al. 1996).

In addition to fragmenting habitat, roads can be a major cause of wildlife mortality (Forman et al. 2003) or cause wildlife to avoid habitat near roads altogether (Gibeau and Heuer 1996; Jalkotzy et al. 1997), limiting their habitat area and ability to fulfill certain needs. As noted by Forman (2000), public roadways directly influence 20 percent of the land in the United States; this impact to land is having significant impacts to our wildlife heritage. This project presents the opportunity to mitigate this impact.

The PEIS recognizes the effect that roads, increasing development, and human intrusion have on wildlife movement. However the statement on Page 3.2-5 "No quantitative data exist regarding how a road's design regulates its barrier effect" is not accurate. Dodd, et al. (2003) presents data on this barrier effect and we suggest this work be incorporated into the PEIS. Furthermore, it is our understanding that Dodd has continued to work on this issue and will be publishing additional information on this topic. CDOT should consult with Dodd to incorporate the latest information available on this topic into the PEIS.

In addition to Dodd's work, other research exists on the quantitative effects roads have on particular species. For example, Noss (2002) showed that as road density increases to six miles of road per square mile, mule deer habitat falls to zero. Deer will tend to avoid areas within ¼ - ½ mile of roads, depending on traffic, road quality, and the density of cover.

We strongly urge to CDOT to review the scientific literature on the impacts to wildlife and include additional information from this body of work (which is extensive) to the Biological Resources section of the Draft PEIS. This information is critical for the decision-makers.

The PEIS does a good job of presenting how the animal-vehicle collision data was used and the importance of this information in the design of the alternatives. CWF is a strong advocate for the use of science in planning and analyzing projects, such as the I70 Mountain Corridor, and is encouraged that CDOT has used this data. We strongly encourage that CDOT continue to collect this data through the NEPA planning process so that this information could continue to inform decision-makers. Furthermore we believe that this data should be continually collected on this corridor to be factored into planning for various phases of this project as CDOT moves forward with implementation.

The use of fencing is an important tool to reduce the impact of roads to wildlife, as several investigators have shown (Lyren and Crooks 2002, FHWA 2000). Fencing is used to prevent animals from crossing roads, directing animals to cross at grade in specific locations, or to direct wildlife to overpasses and underpasses. Fencing has been shown to reduce roadkill by 80 percent in Banff National Park (Guterman 2002). CWF believes that the PEIS should revisit the use of fencing to ensure that this tool is used to maximize wildlife protection and minimize animal-vehicle collisions. It is also critical that the PEIS include measures to ensure that all new and existing wildlife fencing is maintained. Fencing that is not maintained could result in wildlife being trapped within the travel corridor. CWF believes that the initial cost of this mitigation measure will protect lives, reduce property damage and protect wildlife.

CWF encourages CDOT to revisit the wildlife crossings being proposed in the PEIS. Science has shown that the "openness ratio" (openness = width x height/length) presented by Reed, et al. (1975) is critical in the design of wildlife crossings. Based on this factor there are two general principles that CDOT should consider in reviewing the wildlife crossings:

- "bigger is better" when designing underpasses (Clevenger 2002).
- overpasses are more accommodating to more species than underpasses (Jackson and Griffin 1998).

The PEIS should analyze the construction of wildlife crossings that maximize the openness ratio. It is CWF's opinion that the costs of these crossings will not significantly increase the overall budget of this large project and will make travel on the corridor safer by reducing animal-vehicle collisions.

Based on the research conducted on wildlife crossings CWF encourages CDOT to consider a full suite of wildlife crossings, including at-grade, above-grade, and below-grade crossings for large mammals. It is our understanding that the ALIVE committee recommended at-grade and above-grade crossing structures in addition to below-grade structures. Providing wildlife a diversity of crossings, including span bridges, underpasses and overpasses, will significantly reduce the impacts of the road corridor to wildlife.

The Threatened, Endangered, and Other Special Status Animal and Plant Species Section (3.3) understates the significant effects of the highway on the Canada lynx population. The surrounding habitat along the I-70 corridor is documented to be good lynx habitat with lynx being identified in the White River National Forest and surrounding areas (CDOW 2005). Because the lynx is a federally threatened species and its population numbers are low, direct mortality is having a significant impact on the lynx population in Colorado. The PEIS should incorporate data collected by Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW). According to the CDOW (2001) progress report, "Human-caused mortality factors such as gunshot and vehicle collision are the highest cause of death for lynx > 8 months post-release." Furthermore, the 2005 CDOW progress report indicates that 7 out of the 61 lynx mortalities from 1999-2004 were due to roadkill, representing over 10% of lynx mortalities. CWF deems this to be a significant impact and the PEIS needs to address this impact and appropriate mitigation should be included in the alternatives.

CDOT should explore the option of "protective buying" of private lands adjacent to the I-70 corridor and near wildlife linkage zones. CWF is concerned that these private lands could be developed as this long-term project is being planned and waiting funding. Without these lands the opportunities of restoring wildlife linkages could be lost over time. CWF encourages CDOT to act on this matter now so that these lands are available for restoring critical linkages as the project is implemented.

The I-70 Corridor crosses several major rivers that are important fisheries. These rivers provide tremendous recreational opportunities for many anglers and these resources need to be protected. The PEIS analysis of impacts to these fisheries is very limited. The analysis does not address the cumulative impacts of the proposed actions. For example, will any of the alternatives result in the increased use of winter treatments (e.g. Magnesium-Chloride) that could impact water quality over time in these watersheds? The analysis of impacts to fisheries in the PEIS needs to be expanded to fully analyze the impacts to the fisheries in the numerous watersheds this project crosses.

In conclusion, CWF appreciates the opportunity to comment on the PEIS. We hope that you will carefully consider our comments as you move forward in the planning process. Furthermore, we believe the comments above are substantive comments as defined by NEPA and responses by CDOT should be presented in the Final PEIS.

We appreciate your efforts in reducing the road corridors impacts on our wildlife heritage and hope that as the process moves forward the fish and wildlife mitigation measures are not reduced or eliminated. In fact, we believe the mitigation measures will make travel in this corridor safer by reducing animal-vehicle collisions. CWF is committed to ensuring that all the recommended fish and wildlife mitigation measures along the I-70 Corridor are fully funded.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. Please feel free to contact Patrick Kenney, CWF Board Member, at 720/320-6257 or pmkenney@aol.com if you have any comments or questions.

Sincerely,

					Walt Graul Chairman Issues and Advocacy Committee		
Categorized Comment	595	King, Venessa	Public	5/24/2005	As a current Herman Gulch user, I urge you to please evaluate the area for noise pollution and to allow for some noise protection for the surrounding cabins and frequent hikers, campers, and cross country skiers. Through my years of enjoying the Herman Gulch area the noise impact has been steadily growing and impacting the quality of the experience of the area. For the sake of both the many of us just out for a nice hike in the mountains, and for the surrounding wildlife I would love to see some noise mitigation.  Thank you for your tie in reading all of our coments. Venessa King	Online	
Categorized Comment	708	Kingsley, Charlotte	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action - fix 'choke' points, modify travel demand (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  I am a 57 year old who grew up in Idaho Springs and feel it is ludicrous to build something so expensive and so disruptive with the outcome being that it will be just as congested at the completion of the project as is the object of the project to relieve. That is nuts!	Written	
Categorized Comment	731	Kingsley, Jana	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action - fix 'choke' points, modify travel demand (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  I believe that widening the highway and/or building mass transit would negatively impact small towns along I-70, including, Idaho Spgs, Georgetown, Downeville and Silver Plume to name a few. Yes it would be nice to get from the Denver Metro area to the mountains a lot faster but it would bring some of Denver's problems and traffic issues along with it. We should also try to our beautiful mountains and the increased number of vehicles would mean more of an environmental impact. Americas today are in too much of a hurry to get from point A to point B. The public needs to keep in mind that by the time any proposed plan comes to fruition and is completed, the process could very well have the need to start all over again. Please keep our small towns on the map and our mountains beautiful. Jana Kingsley Janagk1@yahoo.com Englewood CO	Written	
Categorized Comment	119	Kintsch, Julia	Associations & Special Interest Groups	1/12/2005	Thank you very much. I'd just like to say, first of all, that I'm really impressed with the turnout here tonight. It's great to see so many people. And I'd like to thank both the Department of Transportation and Federal Highways for having us all here tonight.  My name is Julia Kintsch. I'm the program director for Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project. Our mission is to protect large connected landscapes in the southern Rockies of Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming. And we have been working on a project over the past year called Living in Colorado's Landscapes.  We've been working with the Department of Transportation and Federal Highway and several other partners to identify the critical wildlife viewpoint areas in Colorado.  So why does that bring me here tonight?  With this PEIS, I'd like to point over here on the right, as you can see, the Department of Transportation actually did a study that our study complements in identifying critical wildlife viewpoint areas. Throughout this ALIVE process they identify 13 wildlife linkage interference zones, and these are really critical areas along the I-70 mountain corridor for wildlife movement.  And over the course of the past year, you know, I've been asking people at the Department of Transportation regardless of what alternative is adopted or promoted through these processes that these linkage interference zones are going to be integrated into this process. And at this time, what my understanding is is that these linkage interference zones, when they're in the project ongoing anywhere along the highway, that they will be considered.  And the reason I'm here tonight standing in front of you is to encourage you, through this process, in the final environmental impact statement and in the record of decision to clearly stipulate your commitment to these linkage interference zones and make sure that these are considered in any alternative, regardless of how -- these are really important for offsetting impacts to our native wildlife population.  Thank you.	Transcripts	
Categorized Comment	443	Kirkpatrick, Jon	Public	4/19/2005	As a worker in the petroleum industry I can clearly see that gasoline powered single-family vehicles are not a viable solution for future transportation. Expanding the number of lanes on I-70 is only encouraging the use of that limited resource, and a resource that is causing pollution that could lead to the end of a habitable environment for mankind. Solutions for I-70 should thus concentrate on mass transit, and not plan for an increased number of cars.	Online	
Categorized Comment	452	Kirsch, Vicki	Public	4/9/2005	I do not support the current draft of the I70 PEIS because it will adversely affect the environment, animals, plant life, people, and communities of the mountains of Colorado. People come to Colorado for an experience of the beauty of the mountains not a larger highway.  Other countries, like Europe and Japan, use technological innovation (Rapid Transit). Why has this not even been considered when the citizens of Colorado have shown in the last election that they want public officials to support a clean environment?  Vicki Kirsch	Written	
Categorized Comment	538	Kleinman, Peter	Public	5/22/2005	I want to stongly support a plan to reduce automobile traffic through the I-70 corridor and also to reduce the generation of exhaust and other pollutants. The best way to do this is to include a rail plan, and to do everything possible to not further destroy the communities along the corridor.	Online	
Categorized Comment	759	Kleinman, Peter	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  I feel itd is essential to develop mass transit and try to reduce automobile traffic through the tunnel. Peter D. Kleinman 1960 Blue Ridge Silverthorne	Written	
Categorized Comment	780	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	Federal Agencies	6/1/2005	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 809 Washington, DC 20004 Phone: 202-606-8503 • Fax: 202-606-8647 • achp@achp.gov • www.achp.gov  June 1, 2005  Cecelia Joy Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Aurora, CO 80011  Jean Wallace, P.E. Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228  RE: I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS).	Written	

Dear Ms. Joy and Ms. Wallace:

Thank you for providing the ACHP an opportunity to comment on the PEIS for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. As you know, the ACHP oversees the review process prescribed in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 470f) (NHPA) and is a consulting party in the Section 106 process for this undertaking. Our comments, therefore, focus on the PEIS's consideration of effects to historic properties. The recommendations below are intended to inform FHWA's and CDOT's efforts in both reaching a decision in selecting an alternative during Tier I of the NEPA process, and in the proposed development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) to guide the further consideration of historic properties during Tier II.

Review of the PEIS was difficult because of the large size and wide format of the document. The PEIS contains much data, but lacks a good, clear summary of the effects of alternatives on historic properties or cultural resources. Section 3.15 and appendix N include a good discussion of the known historic properties within the area of potential effects (APE), but the comparison of alternatives revealed only minor differences in the direct physical impact of the alternatives on historic properties. If this is the case, FHWA and CDOT should focus on visual and noise impacts to historic properties in determining which alternative is most appropriate for the protection of historic communities in the corridor.

A Programmatic Agreement executed with participating Indian tribes (tribal PA) lays out a process for ongoing consultation with tribes as decisions are made during Tier II of the project. FHWA and CDOT should have a single document addressing their responsibilities under Section 106 of the NHPA, with regard to all historic properties and all consultation requirements. We therefore recommend incorporating the tribal PA into the PA currently under development, as an attachment, which will create a comprehensive Section 106 compliance document.

Table 3.15-5 indicates that the alternatives combining two modes of transportation (i.e., 6-lane highway with rail and IMC, 6-lane highway with AGS, 6-lane highway with bus in guideway) would result in the greater noise effects on historic communities. The PEIS concludes that projected noise level increases of 3 to 8 dB(A) for the Six-Lane highway alternative would be barely perceptible to most people in the historic communities (pg. 3.15-16), but that a noise level increase of 3 to 10dB(A) for the three combination alternatives would be perceptible to people in the historic communities; with a 10 dB(A) increase doubling current noise levels. This analysis does not seem to take into account that the difference between 8 and 10dB(A) is not substantial, and that noise impacts for both the 6-lane highway and combined alternatives will be significant. Creative mitigation developed in consultation with affected communities may result in the reduction of noise levels to acceptable levels for either approach. Also, the inclusion of an efficient, affordable transit system as part of the overall project should help reduce traffic volume and the noise associated with vehicular traffic in and around the historic communities along the corridor.

With regard to visual effects on historic properties, Table 3.15-7 indicates that the advanced guideway system (AGS) alternative would cause the greatest visual contrast, and thus have the highest visual impact of the 12 alternatives considered. The minimal action alternative would have the least (low to moderate) visual effects on historic communities. All other alternatives are equally ranked in their potential visual effects on historic properties. With the direct physical impacts on historic properties virtually the same for alternatives under consideration, and the bulk of the alternatives likely to have similar effects in terms of visual and noise impacts, we urge you to carefully consider the views of those residing in the historic communities along the I-70 corridor in selecting a mode of transportation for this project.

The cumulative impacts analysis included some very helpful before and after photographs but did not go far enough in identifying other potential developments (other than improvements to I-70 itself—e.g. expansion of skiing industry, recreation, etc.) that may in the long term affect the character of historic communities along the I-70 corridor. It is apparent from the aerial photos that the original construction of I-70 had a tremendous effect on historic communities along the corridor. It is not clear how much development is anticipated in local and regional planning efforts in communities accessed by I-70, and how those plans may affect traffic levels and transportation needs along the corridor.

We fully support the use of context sensitive design in developing plans for each phase of construction during Tier II. Context sensitive design is critical to addressing the concerns of the historic communities along the I-70 Mountain Corridor and local and state-level historic preservation organizations. Any plans to increase capacity through the National Register eligible historic communities should seek to minimize, and to the extent possible, reduce existing visual, audible, and vibratory impacts to these communities, and incorporate the collaborative problem-solving approach embodied in context sensitive design.

Section 110(f) of the NHPA directs all Federal agencies, to the maximum extent possible, to undertake such planning and actions as may be necessary to minimize harm to National Historic Landmarks. The alternative selected during both Tier I and II should be one that minimizes harm to historic properties, but especially to the Georgetown/Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District. The PEIS acknowledges, and clearly illustrates in the visual impact analysis, that this district and the other historic communities along the I-70 corridor have been severely impacted by the original construction of I-70. We are encouraged by recommendations in the I-70 Central Mountain Transportation Corridor Coalition (Coalition letter dated May 24, 2005) to use context sensitive design for the Georgetown/Silver Plume Hill, "such as cut and cover design with open sided, colonnaded lanes on the hillside that effectively mitigates rock fall hazard, preserves a continuous bike path through the area and avoids widening the roadway footprint through Silver Plume and the Georgetown/Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District" (Coalition, pg 15). This is the type of creative problem-solving CDOT needs to pursue to protect the irreplaceable historic values and setting of the National Historic Landmark.

We are impressed with the recommendations of the I-70 Central Mountain Transportation Corridor Coalition (dated May 24, 2005), which represents 31 jurisdictions, and encourages a multi-modal system that includes highway, transit, aviation, alternative routes, and non-motorized components. The Coalition's proposed alternative is a common sense approach that enjoys broad support of the I-70 historic communities. It identifies transit as the long-term solution for traffic congestion in the corridor; and a highway component focused on the use of context sensitive design, interchange improvements, ramp metering at choke points, and sequencing highway construction and review of purposes and need, after each phase of work, to determine if goals are met. We encourage you to give strong consideration to the Coalition's recommendations.

We also encourage you to consider opportunities in project development for FHWA and CDOT to support and promote the President's Preserve America program. Executive Order 13287, signed by President Bush on March 4, 2003, directs Federal agencies to promote the use of historic properties for heritage tourism and related economic development in a manner that contributes to the long-term preservation and productive use of those properties. CDOT should seek to not only minimize project impacts on historic properties, but to incorporate into project planning, through the use of context sensitive design and collaborative decision-making ideas that will promote the long term sustainability of historic communities along I-70, provide public access to historic sites, and promoting heritage tourism.

Thank you for providing us an opportunity to comment on the PEIS. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Carol Legard, our FHWA Liaison, at 202-606-8522 or via email at clegard@achp.gov.

Sincerely,

Don L. Klima  
Director  
Office of Federal Agency Programs

Categorized Comment	106	Klingelheber, Chris	Public	2/2/2005	I am in favor of mass transit. A train option is my most preferred, but will settle for a hybrid/bus transit. Expanding the highway will fail to correct the problem in the future.	Form
Categorized Comment	41	Knobel, Lisa	Public	1/14/2005	Dear DOT,  As I sit here writing this email in my livingroom, I have a frs row view of I-70 as it passes through Silverthorne. As such, I have a very personal interest in the future of my front yard. I have lived in the mountains now for six years in Vail and Summit County. I love this area for the pristine mountain activities and the convenience of I-70 to Denver. Before that I lived about 60 miles north of Portland, Maine. In both cases, I have experienced first hand the impact of weekend vacationers on the transportation infrastructure. When we decided to relocate to Colorado, we knew that we had to live in the mountains no matter the cost because the traffic issues are not worth the price.  In Maine, they finally finished the expansion of I-95. I'm sure for them it reduced some of the traffic problems. However, the road was built in much more favorable terrain. The land is flatter and less populated. I'm sure it is somewhat a success. However, prior to that, they upgraded the road between Portland and Boston and increased service between the two cities. As far as I know that was a limited success. There were good and bad things about the rail line. I think most importantly, it was not an express service and the train was very limited on the speed it could travel. Yet people still took the train because it was a convenient commute to/from Boston.  So what do I think we should do for I-70? First, the problem with I-70 is not the traffic - it's the accidents. Mostly caused by SUV's traveling too fast for conditions. So adding another lane just means SUV's can travel faster and rollover more often. Adding an HOV lane makes no sense because one SUV rollover blocks that lane for ever.  You really need to revisit the High speed rail alternative. Have you actually visited mountain towns in	Online

Europe which are serviced by high speed rail. Have you traveled to Japan where high speed rail is used extensively? I think the rail option over the long term would provide the best alternative. I know I would prefer to take the train to Denver when I have to go there. Especially when I am flying out of DIA. Also the rest of the transportation infrastructure in the Denver metro area would help to get a person anywhere they want. The bike paths are great, the light rail and busses cover the whole city, it would be heaven to hop on the train, read a book and arrive relaxed and ON TIME to my destination. Summit County also has a more than adequate transportation system to complement rail system. When we lived in Vail, I hardly ever drove my car. The bus system was terrific and convenient for commuting to work.

As for the Front Range Skiers, they would use the rail more than they think. Once they realize how safely, quickly and easily they can get to and from the slopes, they will take the train all the time. Most of the problem traffic is due to the front range skiers/recreationists.

The key would be to make the train ski/bicycle friendly and the fees within the cost of driving to the mountains. I have been to Atlanta two times for conventions. There you can get an unlimited rail pass for four days for \$11. We never had to rent a car. We could get everywhere we wanted to go. It was safe, convenient and inexpensive. I thoroughly enjoyed my trip to Atlanta because I used the rail system. I have also driven in Atlanta - what a nightmare! I prefer to take the train!

In the long run building the train would be quicker than widening the road. The initial cost of the train could be more, but would probably be offset by the lost revenues for the 10 to 20 years it would take to widen I-70 (no one will want to come up here while the road is being built!) I bet we would lose alot of vacationers to other resorts because no one will want to deal with the construction. No one would be inconvenienced during the construction of the train.

Finally and most importantly, a train would greatly improve the quality of life for residents and visitors to our mountain communities. An electric train would be quieter and would create no air pollution. It would not scare the wildlife and probably improve the ability for wildlife to migrate as they did before I-70 came into being. Since the rail could mostly be built between the existing lanes, it would not increase the impact on the surrounding scenery or require drastic changes to our beautiful landscape to complete. Plus a train would probably enhance my property values not ruin them like an I-70 superspeedway would.

Please reconsider widening I-70. It is a very short sighted and bad idea. Please visit communities that are serviced by high speed rail and see how wonderful it can be. I know that the front range does not want to pay for the train, but if you review the referendum results, the mountain communities were for the train. Who do you think would understand the issue better? I believe those of us who live here know better. Please don't ignore us. Please don't ignore the future of Colorado. Please protect the scenery and wildlife that IS Colorado!

Lisa Knobel

By the way, I am not some crazy greenie. I am an engineer, a republican and an outdoor enthusiast.

Categorized Comment	522	Koch, Rob	Public	5/20/2005	I-70 Project Perla Garcia	Online
					<p>I realize I-70 gets crowded but I also know peoples lives would be effected by the expansion. According to the people, the noise would be even worse then it is now, business people feel the construction would drive customers away. Knowing what we mow about I-70 in 20 years it could be the same.</p> <p>I-70 needs to be expended because there is a lot of traffic jam in the freeway. When traffic is too heavy it becomes dangerous ,when it snows roads get icy and people crash more. Building a monorail or a train would eliminate some traffic, if people use the monorail or the train there will be less people on the roads. Traffic is really bad for the air, when people go to the mountains and they come back there's a lot of traffic .The monorail or train is the best option because they will give less pollution.</p> <p>In 20 years later, it could be the same problem, if there's more traffic then there's more things to add. If there's a lot of traffic then there has to add more lanes, trains or even a monorail in 20 years. The population might triple then they make the road 3 times as wide? Just making the road bigger is not the solution.</p> <p>It really doesn't effects me, because I don't use it it's really far away from me. I live in Westminster and the mountains are in Vail, I still don't drove to the mountains. I am not old enough to drive I don't want to pay for it either. The I-70 expansion did not leave me with the feeling like I wanted to know more about it.</p> <p>The I-70 project is very crowded now widening I-70 may not solve the population problem because people continual to move to the mountains all the time. The problem could be the same meaning as the years go by so the population growth a solution to the problem could be building the monorail or the train, because I don't use I-70 it really doesn't matter to me if they expended because it does not matter to me expending I-70 is not something I care about.</p> <p>Do not widen the highway look for other options like the monorail or train please make a responsible decision.</p>	
					<p>From: Kullman, Jeff Sent: Thursday, March 03, 2005 6:30 AM To: Galvez, Tara; Wilson, Bob J.; Joy, Cecelia Subject: RE: I-70 mountain expansion</p> <p>Are you expecting a response? If so Cecelia will you please help.</p> <p>----- From: Galvez, Tara Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2005 7:58 AM To: Wilson, Bob J.; Kullman, Jeff; Joy, Cecelia Subject: FW: I-70 mountain expansion</p> <p>FYI.</p> <p>Tara</p> <p>----- From: Kuttner, Otto [mailto:Otto.Kuttner@echostar.com] Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2005 7:54 AM To: governorowens@state.co.us Cc: Galvez, Tara Subject: I-70 mountain expansion</p> <p>Dear Governor Owens,</p> <p>You and I are acutely aware of the issues we face each weekend when we choose to endeavor into our mountains via I-70. The drive is not a pleasant experience.</p> <p>I contacted CDOT in 1997 and have since received regular updates about the proposed expansion. Now it is 2005 and nothing visible has been done! I have seen all the cost proposals and I am glad that the rail option got thrown out. It would have been a total waist of money. However, I think there is a simpler and more cost effective solution to expanding the road than the proposal I have seen.</p> <p>I closely pay attention to traffic pattern when I travel and I-70 has problems that can be mitigated. The section between Floyd Hill and I-70/US40 Exit to Winter Park seems to get jammed when a certain traffic level occurs. However, due to some sharp curves located at the Fall River road exit and west of Floyd Hill, traffic quickly comes to a crawl when drivers slow down for sharp curves. This causes ripples up to 10 miles from the actual point of cause. The speed limit is between 65 and 55mph between Floyd hill and Georgetown, which provides a pretty decent capacity. Now when the speed is cut in half due to sharp curves you essentially cut the traffic volume in half.</p> <p>The solution is to straighten out the road to maintain a steady speed of 65 mph. Since there is very little on-flow onto I-70 between Floyd Hill and the US40 Winter park exit, merging should not cause problems. I would initially attack the problem in two areas Fall River Road and west of Floyd Hill. Construct tunnels to get rid of the curves. Also, perhaps lessen the steep decent you have at Floyd Hill going west bound.</p> <p>When you can safely drive 65 mph on a fairly straight road I believe the problem we are facing today will be history. Perhaps turning I-70 in the mountains into a toll road on weekends will also offset some of the cost of financing it?</p> <p>What do you think?</p> <p>Have a great day!</p> <p>Otto Kuttner IT Architect I Echostar Communication LLC Email:otto.kuttner@echostar.com Tel: 1(720) 514-5192</p>	Email



Categorized Comment	44	Lake, Tripp	Public	1/15/2005	Don't widen I-70	Online
					<p>I realize it must be tempting to widen I-70, given the congestion people regularly encounter. Even setting aside for a moment that we should be using resources to create mass transit instead of exacerbating the existing overcrowding by encouraging more cars, consider the nightmare of 15 years of construction. I drive through I-70 daily, and it is a complete nightmare. Even the parts that are complete aren't that much of an improvement over the old I-25 stretch. It certainly hasn't been worth all of the extra time spent sitting in my car while the modest gain in commute time was built at the expense of many billions. Bottom line: increasing road capacity is a band-aid. Find a solution to the problem of increasing traffic. You are our State's leaders, so lead.</p> <p>Tripp Lake triplake80203@yahoo.com</p>	
Categorized Comment	186	Laman, Leanne	Public	2/14/2005	If they widen I-70 through the mountain corridor, it will kill the businesses and the beauty of our mountain surroundings. We moved up here to get away from the city and the noise.	Online
					<p>We don't feel that it is right for all the skiers, snowboarders and vacationers to take that all away from us. If they want to come up here, they should just have to suffer the consequences and sit in the lines of traffic. Us locals have learned over the years, not to go eastbound on Saturday or Sunday nights for this reason.</p>	
Categorized Comment	398	Larsen, Pat	Public	3/23/2005	We have a summer home in Lawson on old Hwy 40 and have witnessed since 1993 (we acquired a rundown 1890s house there in 1968 when my husband was in Vietnam) the Sunday evening backup (in the summer) as people return from the mountains. We have made available our phone, toilet, and water hose to motorists- it has been a patient and friendly exchange. We understand the same occurs in the winter for those skiing. However, we do not think you can build enough lanes to accommodate a crowd that all wants to travel down at the same time. We think the problem occurs at the Twin Tunnels east of Idaho Springs when cars begin to hit their brakes approaching the tunnel. We have witnessed for ourselves (when returning to Lawson from Denver on Sunday afternoon) that the eastbound backup starts at the entrance to the tunnel and breaks up as the cars get through the tunnel. Perhaps your plan should be implemented in increments to see if small changes make a big difference. Frankly, if you cannot solve the problem of the Twin Tunnels and S-curves between there and base of Floyd Hill the rest of your plan won't make a bit of difference in the traffic delay and a lot of expense and environmental destruction will avail you nothing. You must have someone on staff who could do some computer "modelling" to see how driving behavior could be modified to effect a solution. If the speed limit was reduced east of Idaho Springs before the tunnel to a number that permitted driving through with no braking, that number could be posted with a notice to maintain speed without braking for the next mile. Another possible way to handle this would be to make old I40 between Georgetown and Idaho Springs a one-way road heading east from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on the last day of the weekend. That would give you two additional lanes from Georgetown to Idaho Springs. Local residents could adjust to the loss of westbound frontage road by using I-70 from Idaho Springs to Georgetown and then returning home on I40 going east with the rest of the motorists. I do think most people living there are reasonable people and are familiar with the problem. The solution CDOT has come up with thus far appears to do more harm than good. I know a surgeon does surgery and a highway department builds highways; so you go to an oncologist first if you have cancer and I guess you go to Sato first if you want to question a highway. Also, we follow this issue and think the idea of a toll booth will just cause an additional backup if it is located in the mountains. You would have to place it in Denver around the I470 and I-70 intersection so that cars could get up enough speed to pull the hill. It might be sufficient just to charge a toll for cars going through the Eisenhower Tunnel. Pat Larsen	Online
Categorized Comment	115	Lashley, Raymond	Public	1/19/2005	Raymond Lashley. I am president of Lashley Advanced Bi-Rail Systems Incorporated in Utah. It's a group that I put together to promote and develop this concept that I will talk about.	Transcripts
					<p>Some time ago in a management class I was given an assignment that was supposed to teach me to speak in front of a hostile audience.</p> <p>I am -- I was an instrumentation engineer involved in weapon testing systems. My assignment was surface transportation. How do we move people on the surface of the earth?</p> <p>I got the assignment at 9:00 in the morning, was behind the podium by 2:00 that afternoon, and I got together the rudiments of this idea.</p> <p>I went to our technical library at Point Lagoon Naval Air Missile Test Center, where I worked at the time, and looked at the various transportation modes.</p> <p>It appeared fairly obvious to me that the transportation systems needed must be a high-volume system, it must be reasonably fast, highly reliable, and, above all, safe.</p> <p>It seemed to me this had to be some sort of rail system, and I wondered what was wrong, and why our existing rail systems were not doing the job.</p> <p>Within a short time I had a rail system in existence, and I found that, in my opinion, the equipment, the rolling stock, was far too heavy, far too laterally unstable, and was much too expensive to operate. It is also very slow compared to what we need today.</p> <p>So I went about designing a system that would be lightweight, safe, have a -- be highly stable laterally, and could be built with what we know now, and that was what -- that was the things that I used in putting together the Lashley System.</p> <p>I propose to build a rail system, whose vehicles will be built by "monocoque construction, which is the technology we use to build airplanes, light and strong.</p> <p>These need to be wide-bodied, low-profile systems, instead of what we have today, which are narrow, high systems, with a center of gravity around 10 feet above the rails that are set 56-1/2 inches apart, and the load is about 10 feet wide. That is a guaranteed problem in stability.</p> <p>In our rail accidents today, most of the people are hurt because the train flopped over on its side, not because of the acceleration due to the impact, the longitudinal impact of the vehicles.</p> <p>We have a small model of the LABIS System that has been derailed hundreds of times, and has never once pulled on its side.</p> <p>It's built along the lines of the vehicle depicted in that illustration, the pamphlet. (Exhibit attached).</p> <p>The lightweight vehicle will yield a vehicle-to-payload weight ratio in the order of possibly as high as 2-1/2 to 1. That is 2-1/2 pounds of vehicle to 1 pound of payload.</p> <p>The existing Amtrak train, the way it operates today, has a vehicle-to-payload weight ratio of the order of 40 to 1, which it doesn't take much imagination to know it can never be made properly. It will never pay its own weight.</p> <p>We have recently run some other numbers, which I believe are significant, expressly in today's world, where imported fuel has become so important.</p> <p>One of these numbers is passenger miles per gallon of fuel, and the other one is passenger miles per hour.</p> <p>The numbers we have from existing information that we have found indicates that LABIS will be far superior in efficiency in both these categories than any system in sight.</p> <p>The closest competitor to LABIS in those two categories is the big airplanes. Actually, the airplane we worked with is a 767. We had the information on it, its fuel consumption rate and its ability to carry passengers.</p> <p>Even though it flies at 500 miles an hour, because of its greater load, LABIS exceeds its vehicles -- not vehicle, its passenger mile per hour number by almost a factor of 10, because LABIS holds so many more passengers.</p> <p>I won't try here to go through everything that there is about it. What I am trying to get across is simply that I believe that it should be worth CDOT's time to give me an opportunity to make a full presentation of the LABIS System so that it can be considered.</p> <p>If they're looking for studies that have already been done that will give them significant test data, I don't have that.</p> <p>But incrementally, on every part of LABIS, because it would be built with existing technology, the information is available in today's world.</p> <p>I think that widening of the freeway from Denver west, or trying to use some other sort of train system, or dedicated bus lanes, as has been suggested, are all things that have been tried other places and have never been successful. They work for a little while, and then the old problem usually comes back.</p> <p>I shouldn't have -- I probably shouldn't have included that last part in there.</p> <p>The main thing I'm trying to get across in this message is that I would like to be able to present -- make</p>	

a presentation to CDOT so that someone will look at this thing seriously.

I am about at the end of what I wanted to say, but I do want to point out one thing that I think bears in this situation.

That is that throughout history there have been answers to very tough problems that were inside of everybody and were ignored, and I want to mention especially the incident of the Spencer rifle\*.

In about 1861 a man named Spencer patented a repeating fixed-ammunition rifle that was called a Spencer rifle. He offered it to the Army, and this was, of course, early after the start of the Civil War. The Army Quartermaster Corps refused to even consider it, but Abe Lincoln heard it and test fired the weapon himself.

He saw the advantage of having a repeating arm at the time that the Army was issuing single-shot muzzle-loading rifles, and ordered a number of these rifles to be bought.

They were bought and issued to the troops during the Civil War, where time after time they demonstrated their superiority to the existing single-shot muzzle-loading rifles that the Confederates had.

Then Abraham Lincoln got killed, and the war ended, or in reverse order, and the Army quit buying the Spencer rifle, and they quit issuing the Spencer rifle. They continued to issue a muzzle-loading single-shot rifle that's very clumsy to use.

Not until the '70s did they even go to fixed ammunition, which was a single-shot fixed ammunition. Not until the middle '80s did they adopt a repeating rifle. But the Spencer rifle had already demonstrated its superiority, and long before that there was plenty of fixed ammunition, repeating rifles.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	469	Lavik, Josh	Public	4/29/2005	Advanced Guideway System!!!  Sounds like the best idea yet. It's cheaper, faster, and better than expanding the highway. Sounds like a no brainer to me. I think that it fits well with the mountain community where driving your car to the ski slopes is discouraged.	Online
Categorized Comment	317	Leben Vogel, Lisa	Public	2/9/2005	Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight at this important public meeting. My name is Lisa Leben Vogel, and I'm the county lands director for Clear Creek, and also a Clear Creek County resident.  I would like to address two technical issues in the document. First of all, I'd like to point out an error. I find it extremely discomfoting that our state agency for highways does not correctly identify what portions they actually own and what part of the right-of-ways are only easements. On page ES-36 of the executive summary, its states: The corridor consists of lands under several jurisdictions, including White River National Forest, Arapahoe National Forest, BLM, State Land Board, CDOT, and privately owned lands, multiple and unincorporated jurisdictions. CDOT owns the right-of-way through privately owned lands and occupied easements through US Forest Service and BLM lands.  I'm going to read the Clear Creek County Public Lands Transfer Act in 1993, Public Law 103-253, which was amended in 2002 to provide additional time. The Bureau of Land Management had transferred all the mineral and surface estate they had in Clear Creek County. These lands were transferred to the US Forest Service, Clear Creek County, the Town of Silver Plume, the Town of Georgetown, the Colorado State Historical Society, and the Colorado State Division of Wildlife. These entities succeed the interest of the United States in these right-of-way grants.  As stated in the letter dated April 20, 1995, from the US Department of Interior to CDOT, CDOT was informed that the patents from BLM were issued subject to 15 right-of-way grants and that the patentees are now the service managements agencies. I request that CDOT change the PEIS language to reflect that it occupied easement not only through the US Forest Service and BLM, but also land owned by Clear Creek County, the Town of Silver Plume, the Town of Georgetown, Colorado State Division of Wildlife, and Colorado State Historical Society.  My second comment is directed to a statement on page 3.10-7 regarding land use or ownership jurisdiction. This statement reads: In 1994, BLM transferred more than 2,500 acres or 16.4 square miles of land in Clear Creek County, freeing up more area for the county to grow. This statement is also incorrect.  In fact, 3,200 acres or 5 square miles were specifically required by the public law to be managed and held in the same terms and conditions as if it were transferred by the United States under the Recreation and Public Purpose Act. The management organization for this property is known as the Historic District of Public Lands Commission. 7,400 acres were transferred directly to the county of Clear Creek, the majority of which is land located on the I-70 corridor and adjacent to it. This is all the steep mountainside that you see on the side as you drive down I-70.  The county has sold approximately 1,600 acres, which was required to be combined with adjacent properties and has designated about 300 acres also to be combined. Approximately 5,000 acres has been designated by the Clear Creek Board of Commissioners to be managed as public land under the same terms and conditions as if it were transferred by the United States under the Recreation and Public Purpose Act.  Therefore, only approximately 500 acres will be utilized for development, which is a far cry from 10,500 acres stated.  I request that the maps be changed to reflect the 8,200 acres of additional public land in Clear Creek County corridor, specifically Map 3.10-1, which indicates the 8,200 are private lands.  Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	196	Ledyard, Henry	Public	2/17/2005	I attended the public meeting held February 16 at the Jefferson County Fairgrounds. I was very disappointed in the attitude and air of the CDOT personell and officers present. It left the meeting with wo overwhelming impressions. 1) CDOT is just going through a required-by-law exercise with these meetings having already made up its mind - or maybe had its mind made up for it by someone -- to ONLY consider more traffic lanes along I-70. 2) The public, speaking or listening in attendance on 2/16 almost to a person, favored ANY OTHER approach to the corridor than more lanes. This is not acceptable.	Online
Categorized Comment	711	Lenzmeier, Chuck	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  No response	Written
Categorized Comment	546	Leon, Yolanda	Public	5/23/2005	Yolanda Leon  I-70's traffic is a major problem that need's to be solved. Waiting 6-8 hours in the traffic is something no one want's to pass thru. CDOT should select an alternative that will be cheap, safe, and something that people will enjoy.  The monorail would be a good choice for I-70. It will attract many tourist. There would be many people from many places that would come visit Colorado. The state would make more money and, the ski resort won't loose their tourist. Although the monorail is a very expensive option ,CDOT should think about it.  The six-lane highway is an alternative CDOT should not consider. I really don't think that this option is a good alternative that would end the traffic. Besides it is not safe and it is expensive. There would be many accidents. CDOT should select an option that won't damage anything and, won't put no one's life in danger.  Has CDOT thought about our wildlife? They need to come up with an alternative that won't harm our animals. Our wild life could be in danger because of the expansion. Pollution could kill all the wildlife. The expansion could also destroy the animals homes.  Many towns are gone be destroyed by the expansion. Historic sites will also be destroyed and damaged. Idaho Springs is one of the town's that will get damaged by the expansion. CDOT and the communities that are in danger should come up with an alternative that will work for all of them.  CDOT should listen to everybody before they come up with an alternative. They should also think about water resources, air quality, cost, safety, and energy.	Online

Categorized Comment	335	Leslie, Willie	Public	3/4/2005	<p>Attached is the text of a 3-minute comment I planned to make at one of the hearings. Unfortunately due to distance and time conflicts, I was able to attend only the first hearing.</p> <p>A recent Post article about the expansion planned for Monarch and the potential for that area adds credence to the need to look for an alternate/additional east-west corridor.</p> <p>Willie Leslie cc'd the Denver Post</p> <p>I'm not here today to speak about the impact of the proposed I-70 project on Clear Creek County or Idaho Springs; there are plenty of others who can speak accurately and eloquently about that.</p> <p>No. What I'm concerned most about is the LACK OF VISION displayed by CDOT in their proposals.</p> <p>Sure, the project engineers have made projections about the future. That is not vision. That is making assumptions and then blindly following the same old models to come up with a scenario based on those assumptions.</p> <p>Their assumptions are based on year 2000 data. Folks, things have changed since then, and projections based on 2000 data and old models have proven to be grossly inaccurate.</p> <p>By CDOT's projections, there will be so much auto traffic headed to the Eagle County area by 2025 that even an 8-lane highway would not be adequate. Further, Vail and other destinations would have to make a choice: Do we build a lodge or restaurant, or do we build a parking lot? What is the best use of our land? There is not enough to do both, if CDOT's projections are valid. Is this vision?</p> <p>Before I-70, Vail virtually didn't exist. Copper certainly didn't, nor Keystone.</p> <p>Why hasn't CDOT followed the plan laid out by the Highway Administration when the interstate system was being developed? That plan was to create another East-West interstate from Colorado Springs through Fairplay or along the Highway 50 route from Pueblo through Gunnison when I-70 traffic reached capacity. The lines are already on a map of Colorado at the Highway Administration.</p> <p>I asked about this at a previous meeting, and was told that that alternative was dismissed "because it would not relieve the congestion projected for I-70." Bull. If that is so, why isn't that mentioned anywhere. Further, it goes back to faulty assumptions about demand, and demand can be altered or shifted.</p> <p>Vision. Can't you envision another Vail, or Copper, or Keystone springing up along a corridor other than I-70? Why not plant the seeds now for a new economic powerhouse in this state, rather than blindly think that I-70 is the only answer? This state could surely use it. (Build it and they will come?)</p> <p>Robert Kennedy once used a quote from George Bernard Shaw: "There are those who look at things the way they are, and ask 'Why?' I dream of things that never were, and ask 'Why not?'"</p> <p>Think about it. That's VISION. Thank you.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	91	Lestikow, Greg	Public	1/28/2005	<p>After having attended the very informative public comments hearing in Avon on January 26, I have come to only basic conclusions about the upcoming improvements on the I-70 corridor. I think the most vital idea that came out of the hearing was that Colorado—including its politicians, citizens and businesses—must focus on what their vision of Colorado is in the future. In 50 years, do we want to be compared to California, with its overbuilt and overcrowded highways? Or would we rather be seen as a state that, despite suburbanization and the geographic obstacles our state presents us, decided relatively early on to provide its citizens with a viable mass transit system. I think Colorado has the opportunity to develop into such places as Tokyo, with its bullet train or France, with the TGV. I also know, however, that politicians and the lobbyists that have their attention will agonize over the costs of building a rail or AGS system. As more than one citizen at the Avon meeting pointed out, though, there are many ways to finance a well-planned public transit system, especially when the economic gains created by that system are so promising.</p> <p>Whether speaking in the abstract, as a source of pride and a sense of progress for Coloradans, or in the concrete, as a financially viable move for CDOT and the state of Colorado, the development of public transit into our Rocky Mountains is a healthy and insightful choice for I-70 development. I hope our elected and chosen officials will think carefully about this decision, and about what it could mean for the mountain region and for the entire state.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	137	Levin, Marc	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Good evening. I'm Marc Levin. And most of the people in this room know me. I've been in the -- lived in Colorado since 1973, been a resident of Clear Creek County since 1989. And most of you know that I'll generally tell people what I think regardless of political correctness, and good or bad, that's what I really think.</p> <p>I'm kind of disappointed. When I moved to Colorado, I was hoping we were going to have a development vision that was something like Switzerland, high quality, beautiful mountains, everything done right. And ever since Governor Lamm left office, I've seen Colorado up for sale to the highest bidder under leadership of either political party, both the legislature and the governor's office. I'm really sorry to see that.</p> <p>I think that when the people that built the mountain railway system in the Swiss Alps over 100 years ago were contemplating that project, they were looking at, at that time, what must have been very daunting engineering and financial constraints. Well, that railway system is still a success and used today, still very high-quality standards and ridden quite a bit.</p> <p>This entire project is based on the supposition of continuing population growth and continued availability of cheap oil. And I think those are both questionable assumptions. I think that the cheap-oil issue is obvious. Throughout 50, 70 years I'm not sure we're going to have that. Whether we like it or not, mass transit may be something that becomes a viable alternative.</p> <p>The population growth issue is really a political issue. With -- in the eight or so years I was on the planning commission, we were asked, Well, how come we can't stop this? How come we can't stop that? Well, the reality is, until nationally we decide to manage this country with people that live here now and decide really what our buildout's going to be and decide when we're going to go away from the model, an unending growth-based economy, and decide what our steady state number is, is it 350 million, is it 450 million, is it 500 million, we're not going to be able to stop projects like this project.</p> <p>The reality is that without immigration -- and I have no malice towards any ethnic group or the people of any national origin, but were it not for immigration, this country would be at zero or at slightly higher in population growth. So if the people in this room don't like projects like this, you need to address it nationally. You certainly need to address it in this county.</p> <p>I think Ed Rapp and others are doing a great job, but the job doesn't end in this room. It's time for a national dialogue on what our growth model is going to be and what our limits are going to be. And that's what I think the driving reality is here. And I certainly hope, whatever you build, you build the kind of quality model that Mr. Trapani did in Glenwood Canyon rather than the kind of work that was done here back in the '60s.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	264	Lieberman, Glenn	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/2/2005	<p>Hi. I'm Glen Lieberman. I'm representing SkiCarpool. Skicarpool.com is a website that I've created.</p> <p>And basically, skiing -- or ski traffic is a part of our problem. I realize that the solution is for a full year permanent solution and, you know, ski traffic represents part of that. So I would just like to say that seeing the state and governments support an organization like SkiCarpool and carpools in general would be desirable.</p> <p>We can accomplish a lot by shared rides to the ski resorts. It's a very realistic opportunity. Basically because we have a handful of destinations, and most people live in the metro area. So I would just like to let people know that it'd be nice to see the state support SkiCarpool and carpools in general.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	506	Lilly, Frank	Public	5/16/2005	<p>The draft PEIS is woefully inadequate. It does not address the economic or environmental impact of 15 years of construction in Clear Creek County. It states that impacts will be mitigated, but does not say how. It does not take into account the global reality that we will likely see an astronomical increase in the price of oil in the next twenty years. It limits non-automotive alternatives to an arbitrary \$4 billion cap and twenty-year amortization. It does not say what the heck the mountain communities are going to do with all these extra people once they get here! Please, do not turn the Colorado mountains into Southern California!!!!</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	769	Lindholm, Stacy	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion), 6-lane highway + build mass transit (cost to be determined)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p>	Written

I believe strongly that we need to look to the future and NOT be short-sighted. Therefore, widening the road is not really the answer as we can see in Denver in the T-Rex area. The widening has already become outdated. Mass transit may be costly to begin but will benefit the county greatly in the future.

Categorized Comment	432	Lindsay, Shawn	Public	4/8/2005	I live right off the Evergreen Parkway Exit. This proposal should have been initiated years ago - much like T-Rex. Colorado tends to be reactive instead of proactive when it comes to our transportation needs. I hope that the state moves forward with these plans and construction starts sooner than later.	Online
Categorized Comment	42	Lisa,	Public	1/15/2005	I-70 Put the monorail back on the ballot and let the citizens of Colorado vote. This is the best alternative. No matter how big you make I-70 it will never be big enough - supply and demand. The monorail will benefit the citizens of Colorado and do wonders for tourism. lisa liza@vail.net	Online
Categorized Comment	32	Llerandi, Jerome	Public	1/11/2005	Dropping The Ball While the cost of installing the rail system, compared with widening the existing highway, is given as the argument for preferring the latter, it does not represent a complete picture in that the costs beyond implementation are not considered. Maintenance and operating costs are not included in the calculations. Nor are the rising costs of fuel, environmental damage, nor lives lost in traffic accidents. Further, widening the highway virtually guarantees that we will face the same problems again in a decade. Ultimately the costs to our society of owning a wider highway will dwarf those of owning a rail system. We have an opportunity here to develop new solutions, not only for the problem of traffic congestion, but the larger problems associated with America's overdependence on foreign oil. Those who benefit from perpetuating the current transportation paradigm must not be allowed to control the decision. JEROME LLERANDI llerjer@aol.com	Online
Categorized Comment	665	Loeffler, Robert	Public	5/21/2005	Robert W. Loeffler P.O. Box 114 Georgetown, CO 80444 (303) 569-2268  May 21, 2005  Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011  Jean Wallace, PE Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228  Re: Comments about I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS  1. The Purpose & Need statement sounds good at first blush, and even second blush, but when one attempts to use it, it is evident it is too simplistic to guide an evaluation of the alternatives. Alternatives are to be selected based on which "best meet the underlying need while achieving purposes to varying degrees." (pg 2-126.) I am not comfortable with that. Alternatives should both meet the need and achieve the purposes. Missing is weighting among the purposes and weighting between the need and purposes. Missing also is weighting need, purposes and impacts. I argue that if an alternative does not adequately achieve purposes, the fact that it meets the need is insufficient to support the alternative. I argue that meeting the need is insufficient, too, if the impacts outweigh the benefits. I do not believe the alternatives were weighted in that light.  The travel times are generally indistinguishable among alternatives (save for the no action and minimal action) as shown in Charts 2-4, 5, 6, 12, 13 (and associated tables), Tables B-3, 4. Congestion, however, seems much reduced by transit alternatives over highway alternatives as shown in Table 2-20. All the alternatives (save for the no action and minimal action) meet the 2025 travel demand as shown in Table 2-10. But the transit and combined transit/highway generate the longest-term benefits as shown in Chart 2-3 and Table 2-12. They have less construction impact (e.g., wetlands, part 3-4; summary, pg. 3.19-20). They are more cost-effective (Chart ES-22). Transit alternatives are safer (Chart ES-19, Table 2-22). Transit alternatives have lesser environmental impacts (Table 2-25). Transit alternatives use less energy (Table 3.18-2). Transit alternatives are better achieving community values (Table 2-26).  The preferred alternatives group is the least safe, least cost-effective, produce the least traffic volume and shortest-term benefit, have greater environmental impacts, and do not conform to community values. The distinguishing characteristic which is in support of the preferred alternatives is cost (pgs 2-126-8).  2. It is reasonable that cost play a role in identifying the preferred alternatives. The analysis of cost here, however, appears haphazard.  First, the costs were used to differentiate alternatives without any integrated cost-benefit analysis; they are just absolute dollar costs. It costs more to buy a 2-year subscription to the paper than it does to buy a 1-year subscription, but the differing benefits might affect an analysis of reasonability based on costs. Second, the costs appear to be too conjectural to be used as the decisive factor. Unfortunately, a great deal of analysis of the problems associated with community values — including the environmental issues I thought the PEIS was supposed to address — were generalities with specific analysis left to a later tier. That necessarily means that the costs associated with mitigation and avoidance have not even been identified for the entire project come whatever or for any of the alternatives. Mitigation and avoidance of environmental-community values impacts for some alternatives might be vastly larger than for others, meaning that the relative cost rankings of alternatives likely would change. Some alternatives presently identified as preferred because of cost considerations might lose that status, and vice-versa. You cannot use costs to determine the preferred alternative at Tier 1 and then analyze the impacts at Tier 2.  The environmental-community values analyses do not persuade the reader they were other than superficial. (I live on the east side of Georgetown. The noise analysis is utterly unpersuasive as thoughtful, careful consideration of the issue or of how extended will be the noise impact in the community, particularly in light of topographical affects. I would have the same comment about the analysis for Idaho Springs. Moreover, the acceptable noise limit appears to be too high.) The Mitigation Summary at 3.19 (and Tables 2-25, 26, 27) is such a generic, hopeful list, it could appear verbatim in almost any PEIS. In any event, it neither supports cost differentiation among the alternatives, nor environmental-community values differentiation among the alternatives. Since these are at the heart of a PEIS, it appears there is very much more work to be done before a preferred alternative can be determined.  I note that tunneling at Silver Plume and Georgetown Hill (or a roof on Georgetown Hill) has been rejected. It stands to reason these are difficult, but I do not understand how they came to be determined prohibitive, given their role in congestion, safety, and general community values. It seems likely that any additional highway through Idaho Springs that will preserve the City and minimize air and noise pollution will have to seriously consider a tunnel: instead of going up (really wrecking the towns), go down, and the same is true at Silver Plume. The costs of doing this right could seriously affect the cost analysis of the alternatives.  A major mitigation would be frontage roads in Clear Creek County and possibly between Silverthorne/Dillon and Frisco; it might even more appropriately be considered a project component rather than as mitigation. (I know you talked about it very generally but it is not in the index and I could not find it again.) You did not account for those in the costs as I understand it. Nor did you really analyze the issue in the DPEIS; it seems too important an issue to leave to a later Tier because of the potential impacts and cost.  A more thoroughgoing analysis of the impacts to water from digging up more mine waste piles and construction in/through mine tunnels seems required. One hopes there is but one Argo, but the accumulation of multiple such sites — and it has been suggested you have not accurately identified the number — could have significant impact on water quality and on the costs of mitigation.  Because "detailed planning" in Silver Plume, Georgetown, Fall River Road, Idaho Springs and Hidden Valley have been completed (page 3.19-1), it seems to me the details should be revealed and the detailed impacts and mitigation can and must be evaluated, rather than leaving them in a state of generalization with the details revealed at a later Tier. Third, obviously CDOT has not been able to form a reasonable expectation of ever finding the money for any of the projects in the next 20 years except for the no action and minimal action alternatives, even	Written

when it is being optimistic about revenue sources (pg 5-8). The use of a \$4 billion cutoff of "reasonability" is useless in those circumstances as a determinative criterion. The cutoff has to be the amount you realistically think you can get, somewhere between \$1.6 and \$2.2 billion (pg 5-9 thru 11).

I note, though, that your tolling estimates in Table 5-1 understate the tolling estimates of the Colorado Tolling Enterprise Preliminary Traffic and Revenue Study (Tables 4-12, 13). At least one of you must be wrong.

3. Has it occurred to you that your DPEIS is doing both too much and too little? You did traffic analysis to the nth degree. You recognized the need to address environmental-community values and did so to varying degrees. You just never really finished a complete analysis; you are detailed sometimes ... and sometimes not. Recognizing as you apparently did that a simple Tier 1 analysis doesn't work very well here (and I confess I wonder in what sorts of projects it does work, but I submit that regional transportation improvements probably is not one, although establishing new corridors might be candidates for a Tier 1 analysis), you did more, but not enough. Maybe the problem is that the corridor is not "a" region, but comprised of vastly different areas in terms of the need, purpose, values considerations and impacts.

4. The discussion on construction impacts is another of the generic evaluations that could appear in any PEIS. Nowhere is that more critical than in Clear Creek County, but it is critical everywhere given the construction period anticipated. Beginning at pg 3-9-17, you specifically address the impacts on Clear Creek County, acknowledging their importance, but do little more than denigrate their importance on the ground that most of its population lives on the east side, and most of the affects will be in the I-70 corridor, where the County has a weak economy anyway. I would argue that some of the alternatives carry the potential of destroying the economy and the livability of the corridor portion of the County, and that requires an analysis at Tier 1 so the alternatives can be thoughtfully compared.

"A premise of this study is that the highway would remain operational throughout the anticipated construction timeframe (pg ES-41.) Where in the study is that premise reflected? And how? Hwy 9 and Berthoud Pass were "operational" during construction but if that is how you plan to do I-70 your construction may do more harm than good because the impacts to the corridor could be vastly greater than you describe in your projections of economic impacts during construction. I do not understand your construction impacts analyses to have taken into account time. I feel sure that I have read discussions about the varying lengths of time to construct the alternatives, but I cannot find it now, so perhaps it was in oral comments at one of the PEIS meetings. This is a material omission (if it is in here somewhere, it is not in the evaluation of social-economic impacts) which could impact the social-economic analysis if nothing else.

5. I-70 already goes through Clear Creek County, and people who knew it beforehand would argue that it ravaged the County. There is no other way to get to Eagle or Summit except through Clear Creek unless you take a different route, so perhaps we have to suck it up. But it seems to me the PEIS should consider the sacrifices the County has made already along with a better analysis of the sacrifices it will be asked to make. If we are to be a sacrifice zone like the fabled towns in the Tennessee Valley Authority domain — as we well might be under some of the alternatives — the PEIS should forthrightly discuss that.

In that connection, you should consider that the corridor is the only part of the County which is developable into anything other than single family homes, that the County is likely to be developable predominantly for recreation purposes which will take place in the corridor (whether river-related, greenway-related or historic mine related).

You also should consider that the County already has sacrificed for the Southern Access Road and that it may have to repeat that in spades for the Black Hawk tunnel (either of which might have been justifiable but both of which cannot be justified). What are the cumulative impacts of all of these?

6. The 1998 Major Investment Study created a 50-year vision to change travel behavior with the introduction of transit (pg ES-1). I could not find an analysis comparing the MIS with the PEIS alternatives, which would seem appropriate to reconcile the shorter "vision" of the PEIS and the failure of the PEIS to identify as a purpose travel behavior modification.

7. Some of the evaluations appear to have been done independently of each other when they are dependent. You assume population growth without regard to external factors, such as traffic, and, more importantly, water (see, e.g., pg 1-17 and 2-69). But the PEIS justifies its need based on traffic increase driven by ... population growth and associated recreation growth. I would argue that not only are the growth projections put in doubt, but Baseline, therefore, is not a basis for comparisons, as is argued in the PEIS, because it is invalid.

8. The traffic evaluation is beyond comprehension to a lay person (contrary to CEQA guidelines), after reading Appendices B and C (very soon after Figure C-1, I was lost). I cannot comment on it, notwithstanding that it seems to be the focus of the draft. I hope someone addresses this.

9. Nevertheless, I think I can say that the projected traffic increases (pgs ES-4 etc. and Appen B) seem to be especially amenable to being switched to transit, throughout the corridor. However, some of the transit alternatives do not serve the western part of the corridor, denying that area, particularly Eagle County, any benefit of transit. That should rule out the bus-in-guideaway and the Reversible/HO V/HOT alternative entirely, unless they represent a local alternative only.

10. Demand generated by travel to White River and Arapaho/Roosevelt Forests seem not to be distinguished. (pg ES-7). Yet travel to White River may be relatively amenable to transit, and travel to Loveland would be very amenable to transit. Perhaps a more detailed evaluation of the demands for recreation travel would better identify the potential use for transit (recognizing that some travel objectives simply preclude the possibility).

11. The PEIS says the economic data is aggregated because of the inherent limitations of long term economic modeling and the unavailability of detailed data which could not be generated at a Tier 1 level (pg 3-9-13). On the same page, you say that detailed evaluation of localized impacts is beyond the scope of a Tier 1 PEIS. Whoa! This does not say that detailed data cannot be generated and the evaluation of impacts evaluated, but that they are being postponed until after the preferred alternative has been selected. At that point we are stuck with an alternative the economic consequences of which may prove unacceptable. I would argue that the economic data for your social/economic values analysis must be disaggregated and addressed on individual locality basis. Your evaluation of construction impacts assumes the impacts are spread throughout the 9 counties, patently untrue (pg. J-23). How can you possibly do an intelligent evaluation of the economic-community values impact of construction on such a basis? A regional economic impact analysis, such as Appendix J, simply is not adequate because of the enormous diversity of the corridor counties.

I submit that because the greatest construction impact is to Clear Creek County (pg 3-9-20 and elsewhere), you are duty bound to evaluate the economic impacts to that county before you select a preferred alternative. By the way, Table J-7 is evidently wrong. Although, frankly, I didn't understand it anyway.

12. This aggregation finds its complement in your proposed mitigation of social-economic impacts (pg 3-9-20): the impacts could be mitigated by regional planning with state support. You say this, immediately preceded by a sentence acknowledging that planning is local. This is useless, wishful thinking which cannot responsibly be part of a real analysis of impacts or mitigation.

13. At a time when we are reminded of the cost of fuel for transportation and the need to address global warming to preserve these counties so someone wants to visit or live there, it would seem that the energy consumption of the alternatives would play a prominent role, perhaps a decisive one, all other things being roughly equal. The fact is, we can afford dollars more than we can energy demand. You gave this no weight.

14. You describe the varying wetlands impacts in part 3.6 (Table 3.6-1 and Chart 3.6-1). I do not understand how you avoid addressing Corps of Engineer considerations that the presumption is against filling wetlands unless there is no practicable alternative. 40 CFR 230.10. It does not seem enough to assume "we will work it out with the Corps Engineers," as this analysis does. Indeed, that the Corps apparently has simply agreed that it will work out suggests that it has not done its job, either. To the extent you rely on the Corps' agreement, you need to include the Corps' analysis and agreement in the PEIS. It would seem to me this could influence the evaluation of alternatives, or at least their weighting had there been a proper weighting of purpose (satisfaction of community values) as mentioned above.

15. You state at pg 1-1 that before the Final PEIS a decision whether to plan for accommodating transportation needs for 2025 or beyond 2025 (a 50-year vision), will be made. This I found very troubling. The DPEIS is in fact a short-term analysis. There very likely will be a different outcome if one is evaluating the short-term or the long-term. It is too late to start this PEIS all over to accommodate a long-term vision.

The No Action alternative works until 2020 (optimistic assumptions) and the Minimal Action alternative works until 2025 (Chart ES-8). You do not even have the money and no reason to believe you can get the money for anything other than the No Action or Minimal Action alternatives. Even if you had not asked too late whether to address a short-term or long-term vision, there lies the answer, anyway.

Very truly yours,  
Robert W. Loeffler

Categorized Comment

411 Loevlie, Asta Public 2/26/2005

My name is Asta Loevlie, and I grew up in Idaho Springs. My mom's the infamous Mary Jane that everybody knows so well and Jo Ann. So that's why I'm here to support them, and also, because I've heard about this for the last how many years, Mom?

MARY JANE LOEVLIE: Seventeen years.

ASTA LOEVLIE: So I have to say something. From what I've heard and what I've seen here, I think the

Transcripts

Categorized Comment	409	Loevlie, Mary Jane	Public	2/26/2005	<p>PEIS is completely biased. There's a lot of reasons for that. I think Colorado needs to lead -- Randy -- and I agree with him when he says that -- not follow.</p> <p>And also, from personal experience, I've lived in -- I've been lucky enough to live in Italy as well as Brazil, and there's huge differences in the transportation there. Brazil, I went to the beach one weekend, and it took us six hours to get -- I think it was about 60 miles. I asked my boyfriend, Why? He said, Oh, you know, they just added another lane, it should be fine. They just widened the highway, the streets, and it was worse; it didn't improve anything.</p> <p>So I really think that we need to look at different alternatives. And look at Italy. And there's a lot of people who live there, but they have trains that are amazing, all over Europe, and people use them. And it doesn't need to be a train, but I just think there needs to be -- we just have to think of something else. It can't just be highway. That's why I'm here. Thanks.</p> <p>I never come as prepared as the Rapp family; they're always so well organized. I did want to follow up with Gayle and Joan a little bit. Just to let -- on the record -- to let everyone in the room know, Clear Creek County has been named to the most endangered places list here in the state of Colorado. This has focused a lot of national attention on our 1,400 historic structures in the towns that as yet have not been documented but must be considered in whatever we do with this valley. You can go to the website, coloradopreservationinc.com, and read all about it. It's an amazing thing. And we have national attention on this little valley now.</p> <p>I just want to add to what Joan had to say a little bit. The vision has been lost. We're talking moving people, not cars. People and goods is what we're talking about. Did you all see the article in the Post this morning about the suburbs becoming communities and counting on transit and counting on people not taking their cars places? This is the way of the future. FasTracks is happening.</p> <p>I had an article earlier, I can't find it now, but it's from Dick Lamm in 1988 when the first study came out. He said, if we build six lanes, people won't want to come to Colorado anymore, we're going to Californicate it. 1988, Dick Lamm.</p> <p>Again, 17 years -- you all know I've been saying this for 17 years, and for 17 years you've been trying to shove highways down our throats. This PEIS is blatantly biased towards highways. You put a \$4 billion ceiling for no reason plucked out of the sky to fix 34 miles of highway when you could do 160 miles of transit for \$5 billion. People in the room, think, would you rather have 27 miles of fixed highway, or a wonderful transit system for the future?</p> <p>You also, as you know, took the 20-year horizon rather than your promise when you did the MIS back in 1995 to do the 50-year vision. The MS corridor vision, as CDOT promised, the vision program includes the development -- and this was the consensus along the corridor, everyone agreed on this -- development of a high-speed fixed guideway transit system from DIA to Glenwood Springs, recognizing that an interim measure, conventional technology may be appropriate for the [INAUDIBLE DUE TO COUGHING]. This will be supplemented by the TSM/TDM programs, TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM Management and Transportation Demand Management programs, which we, in Clear Creek County, all buy into. The fixed guideway improvements from West Denver to Vail will be procured during the specifications and the specific technology is not known at this time. The project is estimated to cost \$5.3 billion -- this is in CDOT's own words -- and improvements from West Denver to DIA, which may add as much as 1.2 to the program.</p> <p>The vision strategy of corporate: Transportation improvements compatible with the mountain environments of permanent behavioral change in mobility with more acceptance and support for transit including the needed land use management policy to support this change, the need to optimize the existing infrastructure that we have; the philosophy and finality -- and this is where the promise comes in: What is implemented in this MS program represents a strategic commitment to the vision statement described herein. The build elements include major, fixed guideway.</p> <p>Back in 1988, as I said before, we were very excited that CDOT and the FHWA were actually going to commit to true mobility, and they made a promise to multimodal solution and to the fixed guideway system.</p> <p>Again, our 1,400 historic structures in Clear Creek County, I don't think the people in Grand County, Summit County, if they think it through, want 15 years of cone zone. Nobody will get anywhere in the state, and they will go to Utah. This solution is not a solution; it only exacerbates the problem. Go back to your 50-year promise and do it right.</p> <p>The other thing, since our mayor isn't here yet -- I guess there was a wreck on the highway over Berthoud Pass -- he was going to be here today, but he, again, would request another public hearing in Idaho Springs where the chokepoint is -- the major chokepoint and the major construction -- a public hearing in town, since we are the most threatened by this.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	318	Loevlie, Mary Jane	Public	2/9/2005	<p>I wanted to bring my wheelbarrow with all the studies I've been involved with since 1988, but I didn't. I did bring a couple of them. I'm Mary Jane Loevlie. I'm a resident of Idaho Springs, and have been involved with the I-70 process for approximately 17 years.</p> <p>I dug through my file today and found out -- you've all heard me say this before -- but I've never been on public record, the first study -- the first final study was done in 1988, where the final solution was to widen I-70 through Clear Creek County to six lanes. The participants in that study were one person from Clear Creek, a county commissioner from Eagle, a county commissioner from Summit. Municipalities represented were Avon, Dillon, Eagle, Frisco, Silverthorne, Vail, and Breckenridge.</p> <p>The Federal Highways and Department of Transportation -- I remember Dave Ruble very well, and Division of Highways/highway developers, Breckenridge Ski area, Vail and Associates, Copper Mountain, Keystone, Loveland, and Colorado Ski Country, and the Northwest Council of Governments. Did you see any representatives from Clear Creek County? We got wind of this study when they had to have some kind of public meetings, and we said, Hey, we haven't been included. It needs to be inclusive.</p> <p>We forced -- and I hate to say forced, but we continually wanted to get cooperative effort as it is, so we had to make ourselves known. Then this resulted in the 1990's addendum to the final plan for widening of I-70, which is very lengthy and included all our comments from public meetings, et cetera, et cetera, and it sat there.</p> <p>By that time CDOT and their CDOT engineers were planning widening of I-70 through Clear Creek County, and Clear Creek County said, You know, I-70 is important to the state. It's important to the nation. You can't EA us to death and six-lane us a section at a time. We garnered help from our neighbors to the east and to the west all the way to Garfield County and built a coalition asking CDOT to please take a corridor-wide look at this thing.</p> <p>Five years later, in 1995, we got a major assessment study, and that was hopeful. Participants from Garfield all the way down to Jackson County, 300 people participated in -- I don't know how many meetings. Who can remember? Must have been at least 100 meetings over a three-year time. And most of the time everyone showed up. It was amazing. And in the document we came away with a solution. I just want to read to you the project mission:</p> <p>The overarching mission of CDOT with the I-70 mountain corridor has stated that we will work together to develop the best possible transportation in Colorado. Based on this context and the need to accommodate the goals, interests, and concerns of the stakeholders, a private mission was developed to a collaborative workshop process, the I-70 mountain corridor.</p> <p>It is determined that the mission of the I-70 mountain corridor project was to improve the safety, movement of people and goods through short- and long-term solutions that, number one, deploy innovative technology that minimize or eliminate the impacts of natural and manmade environment; number two, preserve the rural character and community values of communities located within the corridor. Again, this is our vision in 1995. Provide balance and economic development and planning opportunities for the corridor. And number four, it says that those who benefit the most from the improvement pay proportionately.</p> <p>This mission started as the base for developing and evaluating alternatives for solving mobility problems. We all agreed we need capacity relief. I'll go quickly, I just have one minute -- the purpose of the MS over the last two years -- the MS made information sufficient to measure and evaluate a range of investment options, assess public values resulting in a regional consensus on the range of alternatives that were actually studied and whether to go forward. This study isn't nearly as big as the EIS, but it said a lot more. The final vision, in response to the mission, this incorporates the visionary thinking, including a 50-year planning horizon, minimizing closely the highway element, changing highway travel behavior, and preserving for the community and environmental character in a unique setting, as such to incorporate mobility solutions that overcome, la-la-la-la, et cetera, et cetera.</p> <p>Anyway, we were so excited at the conclusion of this 1998 study that we said, Boy, we can't wait. So we started the programmatic EIS. One of the constraints that was never put on the MS was dollars.</p> <p>What the PEIS has come down to is dollars, an arbitrary \$4 billion, which means nothing in the numbers. This does not solve the long-term problems for the state of Colorado. It's not cost effective for the future.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts

Categorized Comment	325	Loevlie, Mary Jane	Public	2/12/2005	<p>I really wasn't going to speak because us -- I'm from Clear Creek County and Idaho Springs. And as a non-local, we really don't want to overwhelm the local public hearings. But we really do believe that CDOT has it backwards. And I wanted to thank Senator Taylor, we're starting to get a lot of legislative support for the flip side of what we want to do.</p> <p>We -- a lot of us in the corridor also participated in the Denver Union Station plans. And we have preserved an envelope for high-speed transit going westbound. So that will be in the new Denver Union Station. We very carefully made sure that that could be the future.</p> <p>I did want to let -- to talk to the sense of place. You in Glenwood have such a wonderful sense of place. And Glenwood Canyon is part of your sense of place. And it's the reason people live in Colorado, really, people come to Colorado, is our sense of places. Clear Creek County just got named to the most endangered places list in the state of Colorado. If you don't have this brochure, I have got several with me. But this sends out -- I can get it for you.</p> <p>This sends out a message statewide and nationally that there are people concerned about the historic and cultural assets in the state of Colorado. We're the first historic communities people see in the mountains when they are coming westbound.</p> <p>So I would just ask that our preferred alternative -- our preferred alternative is none of their preferred alternatives, and that's why we keep speaking out. We think that transit should be built first and later on we do the highway improvements that are necessary. There's so many better ways to do this. This only adds more lanes, no matter which way you look at it. Then in the future it'll add lanes to Glenwood Canyon and every place else in the state. Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	138	Loevlie, Mary Jane	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Hi. I was going to give up my time, but you guys wanted to hear me say it one more time, I'm sure. Does anyone know what the definition of insanity is? Isn't it doing the same thing time after time after time and expecting a different result?</p> <p>We have done this for 16 years with CDOT, telling you the same thing for 16 years. And we continue to get the same results, and you, in turn, are doing the same thing with us, expecting us to respond differently. It's not going to work. We are going to be here. We need a 50-year vision, not a 20-year vision. We've been playing nice for 16 years, and you're obviously not hearing us.</p> <p>Idaho Springs -- the section of interstate through Idaho Springs would never have been built today. That was pre-1966 when the National Preservation Act had not been enacted. You guys are not sensitive. Finally, now, it's not even in the books. We have a Section 108 document, but no one sees it. And today I was told, while there won't be an addendum, we really don't want to take that into consideration. Maybe you can respond to that Joanna.</p> <p>But, again, the definition of insanity. And this \$4 billion pulled out of the air by Tom Norton is absolute BS, as you all know.</p> <p>Why build a dinosaur when we can be a vision for the future, a vision for the world, attract people -- not have people move away. Sixteen years is long enough. Had you listened to the MIS in 1998, we would have been six years into the project, building a visionary 21st century transportation system.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	612	LoSasso, Wendi	Public	5/24/2005	<p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>May 24, 2005</p> <p>Re: I70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>I have lived in Colorado all my life and I have been a resident of Vail since I was seven. I am currently a business owner in Vail. I am concerned that the expansion of I-70 will be detrimental to my business, my quality of life and to Vail. Vail is the best ski area in North America, we are small business owners, we are a small town. We attract visitors because of the natural beauty of the area and the solace the mountains provide. The expansion of I-70 would mean you could hear the highway on Vail Mountain or in the Village. Not very attractive, noise pollution! Eight lanes of road would further mar the beauty of the Gore Valley.</p> <p>Within the past four years the highway noise has grown and continues to grow in Vail. It is concern in all living here. Our lovely homes and woodlands are constantly be invaded by noise and the light pollution of cars and trucks. Many neighborhoods are putting burms in place to dispel noise from their communities. Eagle County is a safe place to live despite I-70 expansion will further hinder the safety of our towns. Our police force would have to patrol even more meaning more monies from Vail taxpayers. Many travelers already speed on I-70; eight lanes would make speeding horrendous especially, during the winter when the roads are bad.</p> <p>The expansion of I-70 would lead to an economic collapse in Eagle County. The noise, light pollution, air pollution, ugliness of eight lanes would lead us to ruin. Leaving the reasons you want to expand a mute point.</p> <p>The current study does not entail anything about climate changes due to asphalt and carbon dioxide. There are studies that say highways change climates this would be interesting considering we need the snow for skiing, and later for water. Climate Changes of an eight lane highway warrant a study of the possible negative impact to Ski Areas. The environmental impact of less water would impact all of Colorado, Utah, and Nevada...</p> <p>Currently I-70 is in violation of the Clean Water Act atop Vail pass due to the amount of sand and salt put on the road. Expansion would double a problem you already can not get a handle on. Tons of salt and sand litter the sides of the road and run down into Black Gore Lakes, the Black Gore and eventually into Gore Creek. Colorado Department of Transportation has already had troubles funding a clean up project. Which I think is deplorable in your part.</p> <p>Currently I-70 travels though several Elk, Deer, Lynx, migration areas their migration patterns have been affected and should be restored to viable linkages, rather than disrupted further. The loss of wildlife due to the highway should not be ignored.</p> <p>Expansion of I-70 would be difficult to negotiate especially since much of the current road runs next to the Eagle River with steep rock faces on the other side. Expansion would be costly, taking years, causing years of delays and construction for no benefit but more road. The years of construction would be disruptive to businesses, and the daily life of those living here. We are despite I-70 a small mountain town.</p> <p>We can not build our way out of traffic. We need to encourage public transportation, get the railroads operating again to move merchandise and people. Expanding I-70 will only lead to further sprawl without thought or plan.</p> <p>I oppose additional highway lanes except for the "Minimal Action" Alternative and support the "Rail Alternative" with modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Elevated structure</li> <li>o Electric Rapid Rail</li> <li>o Independent of highway right-of-way</li> <li>o Built in phases</li> <li>o Spurs from main line to high-volume destinations</li> <li>o Integrated feeder and distribution network</li> <li>o Constructed with existing designs and technology, no significant R&amp;D needed</li> <li>o Construction and operation to commence as soon as feasible.</li> </ul> <p>I would like a better solution to this age old problem to traffic congestion. We've built and built roads, never solving the problem. We need alternatives to driving individual cars: public transportation is our only way out. I would like to see a creative solution that does not include more lanes of asphalt.</p> <p>I would like to see something that we could be proud of, Public Transportation, transportation in which you don't have to drive a car in order to take advantage of it or use it. This is the only way to get a mass of people to a destination safely without ruining what they are coming for.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Wendi LoSasso 2992 B Bellflower Dr. Vail, Colorado 81657</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	290	Lunberry, Dennis	Municipalities	2/9/2005	<p>Good evening. My name is Dennis Lunberry. I'm the mayor of Idaho Springs. I'm pleased to have this opportunity to be here.</p> <p>Tonight I want to comment about two areas related to the draft PEIS. Its inadequacy with -- especially with respect to Idaho Springs and its failure to meet the requirements of the NEPA. Obviously, this cannot be done in a detailed short amount of time allotted, but the general points I want to make will be supplemented with written comments to be provided as part of the public comments process.</p>	Transcripts

Before I begin, though, I want to take this opportunity to formally extend to CDOT and FHWA the offer I made at the January 12th MCAC meeting, and that is, if the comment period was extended, as it has been, then I would be pleased to host an additional public comment session in Idaho Springs at city hall. Since the first public comment session was held at Clear Creek County early on, the people had not then had time to fully review the draft PEIS.

This additional session would provide CDOT and FHWA an opportunity to receive more complete and more fully developed input from the public, especially the Idaho Springs public. We think this is important because, as you know, Idaho Springs would be one of the most significantly impacted areas under any of the preferred groupings of alternatives.

It is the position of the City of Idaho Springs that the alternatives in the preferred grouping -- based on our current understanding, it is a complex draft PEIS -- are all inadequate and inappropriate for our community and for most -- and for the most critical reaches of the I-70 corridor. They are inadequate and inappropriate because they do not meet the specified needs for improved accessibility and mobility, nor do they meet the need of decreasing congestion. They also do not appear to meet the purposes of environmental sensitivity or respect for the community values.

Others have noted in their comments the shortcomings of the draft PEIS and its analysis of mobility impacts and the economic disruption, and we agree with those comments. We believe that if the preferred alternatives are carried forward, they will have significant negative impacts on the economy, the environment, the historic character, and the quality of life for residents of Idaho Springs and Clear Creek County.

In addition, we think that the draft PEIS fails to meet the requirements that it should under NEPA, CEQ, and FHWA regulations. Here are some examples. Under 40 CFR 1502.1, relating to purpose, it states in part that the PEIS, quote, Shall provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts, and shall inform decision makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of human environment. Statements should be concise, clear, and to the point. This is not the case with this draft PEIS.

Under 40 CFR 1502.2 it states that, quote, "Environmental impact statements shall be analytic rather than encyclopedic." This PEIS is encyclopedic rather than analytic.

Under 40 CFR 1502.14, relating to alternatives including proposed actions, it states that for environmental consequences, the PEIS should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among the options by the decision maker and the public. We believe the format of the environmental impact as currently presented do not sharply define the issues and tradeoffs so a clear basis for choice is provided to the city or to other decision makers. Quite the contrary is the case.

The city also believes that mitigation options and commitments are not addressed in sufficient detail to understand the relative advantages and disadvantages associated with each alternative. More detail is required in the PEIS. Details should not be deferred until Tier 2 environmental documentation.

The city believes that a very strong commitment and greater detail are required in the 20- to 50-year planning document. We would refer you to Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council at 490 US 332 from 1989, which indicates that mitigation must be discussed in sufficient detail to ensure the environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated. Also, Holy Cross Wilderness Fund v. Madigan in the 10th Circuit Court in 1992, and Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain versus United States Forest Service in the 9th Circuit, 1998, say that a clear listing of mitigation measures is insufficient to qualify as a reasonable discussion required by NEPA.

And in Idaho Sporting Congress v. Thomas in the 9th Circuit in 1998, it was noted that, quot, without analytical details to support the proposed mitigation measures, we are not persuaded that they amount to anything more than a mere listing of good management practices.

Lastly, in many published FHWA policy and guidance documents, notably FHWA's Environmental Policy Statement of 1994, the commitment to implement a strong mitigation program is the prevailing theme. The detailed steps needed to ensure an effective mitigation program are missing from this environmental analysis.

In summary, the City of Idaho Springs believes the significant reevaluation of the alternatives proposed for meeting the stated purpose and need is required. This reevaluation should objectively assess the suggested changes in one or more culled alternatives will be submitted at the close of the public review period.

Based on revised analysis, the city believes the alternatives assigned to the preferred groupings will change substantially. We also think the draft PEIS as presented fails to meet the requirements that it must under NEPA, CEQ, and FHWA regulations and that there are legal precedences to support that belief.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	696	City of Idaho Springs	Municipalities	5/23/2005	City of Idaho Springs 1711 Miner Street P. O. Box 907 Idaho Springs, CO 80452-0907 Telephone: 303-567-4421 Fax: 303-567-4955 cis@idahospringsco.com	Written
				May 23, 2005	Cecilia Joy Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011	
					Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228	
					Subject: City of Idaho Springs Public Comments on the Adequacy and Conclusions of the Draft I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement	
					The City of Idaho Springs (City) submits the following comments on the December 2004 Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the I-70 Mountain Corridor project. We appreciate the extended period for public comment and hope to see a response to the serious issues and requests we raise. We request that our comments be entered into the administrative record.	
					The City agrees with and incorporates by reference the joint review comments from Clear Creek County, Clear Creek Economic Development Corp., and the Clear Creek I-70 Task Force regarding Draft PEIS issues and conclusions.	
					The City concludes the draft PEIS has substantial flaws that impair its ability to provide an objective and unbiased disclosure of the environmental, social, and financial effects of the alternatives. Therefore, its conclusions regarding the relative abilities of the alternatives to meet the proposed action's purpose and need are significantly flawed. Both the document and the analysis process need major revisions to comply with the spirit and intent of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Federal Highway Administration's NEPA implementing regulations. The draft PEIS possesses major procedural omissions and factual errors that significantly affect the conclusions and the relative performance of the alternatives. Examples are described in the following sections.	
					Based on these omissions and errors, the City requests:	
					• Revisions of the draft PEIS document and analysis to correct these problems;	
					• Addition of a new alternative;	
					• Reassessment of all alternatives using a balanced approach that avoids or corrects the identified problems and gives equal weight to environmental, technical, social, and cost factors.	
					Significant Revision of the Draft PEIS is Needed	
					The draft PEIS possesses procedural and content errors that adversely affect its ability to meet the spirit and intent of NEPA. The document is incomplete and does not provide a balanced disclosure of the trade-offs of the alternatives. Several fundamental requirements of NEPA-compliance are missing. Because of these errors it is impossible to independently determine whether the conclusions on the group of preferred alternatives are accurate or reasonable. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows:	
					1. The draft PEIS does not meet the direction of Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) to provide a clear, concise, and to the point description of the trade-offs associated with each alternative. 40 CFR Section 1502.1 (Purpose) states in part:	
					"...Agencies shall focus on significant environmental issues and alternatives and shall reduce paperwork and the accumulation of extraneous background data. Statements shall be concise, clear, and to the point, and shall be supported by evidence that the agency has made the necessary	



environmental analysis..."

The two-volume draft PEIS is more than 1,400 pages long and is not clear nor to the point. Differences in impacts among alternatives are hard to compare and in many cases simply identifying the impact of each alternative and its reasons are difficult.

The document has compiled extensive background details that do not appear to contribute to effective decision-making and impair our ability to understand the trade-offs. For example, the executive summary only compares the capabilities and effects of 12 of 21 alternatives in Charts ES-11 and ES-12; 21 alternatives in Chart ES-13; 10 alternatives in Chart ES-14 all for the same highway section compared in Chart ES-13, and then excludes the no-action alternative in some summaries (Chart ES-21 with 13 alternatives), while showing 21 alternatives in other summaries. There are many other examples. This organization substantially impairs the public's ability to understand the effects of the decisions to be made.

Therefore the EIS should be revised to provide a clear and to-the-point summary comparison of the trade-offs among the 22 (or more, if our later request is included) alternatives for environmental, social, historic, cost, corridor capacity, regulatory compliance, and cost considerations.

2. The draft PEIS does not meet the direction of CEQ to provide a clear comparison among alternatives. 40 CFR Section 1502.14 (Alternatives including the proposed action) states in part:

"...it should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decision-maker and the public..."

The comparison of alternatives from environmental, City issues, cost, and ability to meet the purpose and need of the proposed action is incomplete, inconsistently presented, and confusing. The comparison of impacts among alternatives, including the no-action alternative (where considered) is neither clear nor sharply defined. The result is that the City and the public have a very difficult task in determining a clear basis for choice about which alternative represents the best balance of improved mobility and environmental and community costs. This difficulty is a significant concern because of the wide range of potentially significant adverse impacts the City faces with selection of a preferred alternative.

Difficulties begin with the Executive Summary and continue throughout the entire draft PEIS. In addition to the examples noted in point 1 (above), additional Executive Summary examples include:

- Impacts of the no-action alternative are presented for some resources (e.g., Charts ES 23, ES-24, and ES-25), while omitted from other resources (e.g., Charts ES-27, ES-28, and ES-33);
- Comparative effects on economic conditions under each alternative are not provided (Chart ES-36);
- Comparative effects on historic (a major concern of the City), recreation, and preliminary 4(f) resources are not provided on an alternative-specific and comparative basis (pp. ES-37-38);
- The comparison of noise impacts introduces a different combination and definition of alternatives (8 alternatives in Table ES-3);
- Cumulative impacts are not presented as alternative-specific disclosures. Depending on the resource category discussed, the effects are described for different numbers of groups ranging from 0 for air quality (p. ES-42) to three (no action is not addressed) for wildlife, endangered species, wetlands, and water resources (pp. ES-42 and ES-43).

3. The draft PEIS does not meet the direction of CEQ to provide the public with information that is incorporated by reference and used to support analysis of alternatives, especially the no-action alternative. 40 CFR Section 1502.21 (Incorporation by reference) states:

"Agencies shall incorporate material into an environmental impact statement by reference when the effect will be to cut down or bulk without impeding agency and public review of the action. The incorporated material shall be cited in the statement and its content briefly described. No material may be incorporated by reference unless it is reasonably available for inspection by potentially interested persons within the time allowed for comment. Material based on proprietary data which is itself not available for review and comment shall not be incorporated by reference.

The draft PEIS and the analysis of the alternatives does not comply with this requirement. For example, a significant transportation project potentially affecting selection of the preferred I 70 Mountain Corridor alternative; modeling traffic demand, flow, and volume; and determining cumulative effects of the alternatives is the future connection of I-70 and Colorado Highway 119 for access to the Central City and Blackhawk gaming area. This project is included as a major component of the no-action alternative (no-action serves as the basis of comparison for all alternatives) (p. ES-10) and it is recognized in the draft PEIS as an issue of concern (p. ES-46). The Gaming Area Access draft PEIS is referenced many places in the draft PEIS as either a reference support document or as a basis for impact determinations of no action (e.g., pp. ES-10, ES-46, 1-3, 1-10, 2-18, 3.2-8, 3.2-18, 3.4-24, 3.5 4, and dozens of additional examples), yet the draft PEIS also notes this reference document is still under development (e.g., pp. ES-10 and 2-18). Thus, this pivotal document, that directly affects the evaluation and ranking of alternatives which may adversely affect the City and its lands has not available to the public for review during the comment period.

4. The draft PEIS does not meet the requirements of CEQ and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to analyze the no action alternative. CEQ 40 CFR Sections 1508.25 and 1508.25(b) (Scope) state in part:

"Scope consists of the range of actions, alternatives, and impacts to be considered in an environmental impact statement (emphasis added). The scope of an individual statement may depend on its relationships to other statements (Sections 1502.20 and 1508.28). To determine the scope of environmental impact statements, agencies shall consider 3 types of actions, 3 types of alternatives, and 3 types of impacts They include:...

(b) Alternatives, which include:

1. No action alternative
2. Other reasonable courses of actions.
3. Mitigation measures (not in the proposed action).

(c) Impacts, which may be: (1) Direct; (2) indirect; (3) cumulative."

Even though FHWA regulations for implementing NEPA 23 CFR Part 771 (Environmental Impact and Related Procedures) do not specifically mention a requirement for a no-action alternative or what analysis it requires, section 771.123(e) (draft environmental impact statements) requires DEIS compliance with NEPA. It states:

"(e) The Administration when satisfied that the draft EIS complies with NEPA requirements (emphasis added), will approve the draft EIS for circulation by signing and dating the cover sheet."

FHWA Technical Advisory T-6640.8A (Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, October 1987) provides guidance for implementing 23 CFR Part 771 in compliance with NEPA and defines requirements for the no-action alternative and its evaluation. It defines the no-action alternative at Section V.E(i):

"No-action" alternative: The "no-action" alternative normally includes short-term minor restoration types of activities (safety and maintenance improvements, etc.) that maintain continuing operation of the existing roadway."

It defines analysis requirements for all EIS alternatives at Section V.G. It states in part:

"This section includes the probable beneficial and adverse social, economic, and environmental effects of alternatives under consideration and describes the measures proposed to mitigate adverse impacts. The information should have sufficient scientific and analytical substance to provide a basis for evaluating the comparative merits of the alternatives..."

"...The following information should be included in both the draft and final EIS for each reasonable alternative (emphasis added):

1. A summary of studies undertaken, any major assumptions made and supporting information on the validity of the methodology (where the methodology is not generally accepted as state-of-the-art).
2. Sufficient supporting information or results of analyses to establish the reasonableness of the conclusions on impacts.
3. A discussion of mitigation measures. These measures normally should be investigated in appropriate detail for each reasonable alternative so they can be identified in the draft EIS. The final EIS should identify, describe and analyze all proposed mitigation measures for the preferred alternative..."

There are two important reasons the draft PEIS does not meet the requirements of CEQ and FHWA for a meaningful and technically sufficient no-action alternative analysis. Although the draft PEIS establishes and describes the no-action alternative, it does not:

- Provide a complete and accurate analysis of the future environmental conditions it creates.

- Provide a cumulative impact analysis of the no-action alternative.

These deficiencies create an inaccurate and biased assessment of the adverse and beneficial effects of the action alternatives, especially those placed in the preferred group of alternatives. In addition to the situation described above when the draft PEIS references no-action alternative impacts in a document that does not exist (Item 3 above), examples of draft PEIS discussions supporting this conclusion include:

Inaccurate and incomplete analyses of impacts for no action are illustrated by numerous impact tables/charts. For example, Water resources Chart 3.4-6 (p. 3.4-24 and pp. A-26 to A-28) shows no effect to water quality in Clear Creek Watershed from the no-action alternative. On the same page (p. 3.4-24) the draft PEIS describes two no-action projects (Gaming Area Access and Hogback Parking Facility) that occur in the Clear Creek watershed and would have impacts. They are not accounted for in the impact analysis. This same problem occurs in many other no-action natural resource assessments (e.g., wetlands, endangered species, riparian areas, vegetation, wildlife, and fisheries) at pp. A-23 to A-28. However, resource impact analyses are provided for no action on air quality (pp. A-33 and A-34) and noise (p. A-32).

- Draft PEIS Chapter 5 (Cumulative Impacts Analysis) does not provide a cumulative impacts analysis of the no-action alternative. A cumulative effects analysis is required of each alternative as described by 40 CFR Sections 1508.25 and 1508.25(b) (Scope).

- Table 2-27 (Summary of Cumulative Impacts, p. 2-125) provides the same statement of "no cumulative impact" for all resource categories evaluated for the no-action alternative. However, there is no supporting analysis in this chapter or elsewhere in the draft PEIS to support this conclusion. Therefore, we conclude this conclusion is an assumption, not a finding based on rigorous analysis.

Based on these and other similar examples, the draft PEIS is considered incomplete because it does not evaluate the no action alternative to the same level of detail as the other action alternatives in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 1500 to 1508.

5. The draft PEIS does not meet the requirements of CEQ and FHWA to analyze and disclose the cumulative effects of each alternative. The absence of the cumulative effects analysis of the no-action alternative and the regulatory basis for the required analysis were described in item 4 above. CEQ requirements for a cumulative analysis of each alternative are described in Sections 40 CFR 1508.25 and 1508.28(c) which are presented in part in item 4 above. Section 40 CFR 1508.25(a)(2) defines cumulative actions and established the need for a cumulative impacts analysis. It states:

"2. Cumulative actions, which when viewed with other proposed actions have cumulatively significant impacts and should therefore be discussed in the same impact statement."

The FHWA in its position paper (Secondary and Cumulative Impact Assessment in the Highway Development Process, currently on FHWA's Environmental Guidebook website) describing current policy for analyzing cumulative effects makes the following statement:

"These mandates place new emphasis on the examination of secondary and cumulative impacts. That is, the FHWA and the SHAs must produce systematic analyses of environmental, social and economic impacts of sponsored projects that include coverage of secondary and cumulative effects. Otherwise, the analyses most likely will be incomplete under the FHWA commitment to [page 3] comprehensive environmental and public interest decisionmaking." (emphasis added)

In January 2003 FHWA issued interim guidance to Division Administrators and other FHWA managers regarding the approaches to be used to address cumulative impact considerations in the NEPA process (Interim Guidance: Questions and Answers Regarding Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Considerations in the NEPA Process, January 31, 2003). That guidance established the point that each alternative requires a cumulative impact analysis. Page 16 of the interim guidance specifies EIS documentation requirement and makes it clear the intent is to evaluate each alternative for cumulative effects. It states:

"Documentation. While documentation is not the end-all-be-all of the NEPA process, it is important that we do a reasonably good job of communicating the purpose and need of the project; the values used to develop and compare alternatives; the results of analysis for direct, indirect impacts, and cumulative impacts; and mitigation as required by relevant regulation (emphasis added). An environmental impact statement EIS, or in some cases an environmental assessment EA, may be the most obvious and scrutinized part of the NEPA process. It provides evidence to the public and participating agencies of our commitment to, and satisfaction of the NEPA requirements Environmental documentation must communicate clearly the results of project analysis and the subsequent decisions."

This FHWA guidance also provides an example (p. 8) of what a federal court found to be an acceptable approach for assessing cumulative impacts. The description states:

"Where cumulative impacts are concerned, one leading court in *Fritolofson v. Alexander*, 772 F.2d 1225 5th Cir. 1985, addressed cumulative impact analysis using the following five-part evaluation:

1. What is the geographic area affected by the project?
2. What are the resources affected by the project?
3. What are the other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions that have impacted these resources?
4. What were those impacts?
5. What is the overall impact on these various resources from the accumulation of the actions?

There are four important reasons why the draft PEIS cumulative impact analysis and discussion of effects are incomplete and inaccurate representations of the potential cumulative consequences of each alternative. The cumulative impact analysis does not:

- Analyze each alternative separately and disclose the potential alternative-specific effects (as per part 4 above) relative to the other alternative;
- Disclose the other specific past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions that impact resources (as per part 3 above);
- Disclose the overall (i.e., cumulative) impact on various resources from the combined projects (as per part 5 above); and
- Provide an accurate or consistent description of cumulative impacts.

Examples of the draft PEIS showing incomplete and inaccurate representations are as follows:

- Both Chapter 5 (Cumulative Impact Analysis) of the draft PEIS and the Chapter 2 summary table of cumulative impacts (Table 2-27, p. 2-125) compare alternative as five categories. Only minimal action and no action alternatives are addressed separately. The remaining alternatives are lumped into three other groups.

- Summary table (Table 2-27, p. 2-125) does not include all the resource impacts that are described in Chapter 5. For example, cumulative impacts on threatened and endangered species, riparian areas, fisheries, section 4(f) properties, vegetation, noise, and community values are not provided. Cumulative impacts of noise, community values, and section 4(f) properties are of particular City concern because of direct adverse impacts being experienced from the existing highway use.

- The cumulative impact analysis primarily describes effects associated with assumed population growth induced by increased highway capacity, which is an important corridor consideration. However, equally important is disclosure of cumulative impacts of all proposed highway improvements in Clear Creek County and in the sphere of influence of the City. For example, many of the preferred group of highway expansion alternatives include expanding and/or upgrading three existing I-70 interchanges in the City, modifying Twin Tunnels, curve-smoothing east of the City, and making highway improvement through the City. The cumulative effects of these changes within Idaho Springs and Clear Creek County which are the locations that must endure the most extensive environmental and social changes are not (but must be) addressed by the draft PEIS. The City requests the cumulative effects analysis be revised to address these cumulative impacts for both the City environment and for Clear Creek County.

6. In accordance with CDOT and FHWA intentions to define more specific mitigation measures for the preferred alternative identified in the final PEIS and the record of decision and as a result of the direct and indirect impacts of implementing the Tier 1 preferred alternative, the City requests that CDOT and FHWA commit to the following provisions and that the following mitigation commitments be incorporated into these decision documents:

- Loss or significant degradation of key wildlife habitat or wildlife crossings will be replaced on a 1 to 1 acre and/or functional value basis either through purchase of open space or through enhancements of degraded areas.
- Noise effects will not be permitted to exceed either federal or state standards within the City of Idaho Springs city limits.
- Concentrations of regulated water quality parameters, particularly zinc, copper, cadmium, and manganese will not be permitted to exceed either federal or state standards for designated beneficial uses in Clear Creek within the upper Clear Creek watershed and within the City of Idaho Springs city limits.

- Existing recreational facilities lost or significantly degraded by the preferred alternative will be replaced in-kind at no cost to the City of Idaho Springs.
- Existing water, wastewater and other infrastructure utilities either destroyed or significantly degraded by construction or operation of the preferred alternatives will be replaced in-kind at no cost to the City of Idaho Springs.
- Impacts on the Historic district will be avoided. Effects and impacts will be positively mitigated through enhancements such as improved parking facilities at no cost to the City.
- Street and parking capacity improvements and by-pass routes which increase transit traffic or needed during construction periods to accommodate traffic detours of the preferred alternative will be designed and constructed at no cost to the City of Idaho Springs.

7. The draft PEIS (Section 3.16, pp. 3.16-1 to 3.16-20 and Appendix O) contains an incomplete inventory and assessment of Section 4(f) properties within the City limits and sphere of influence. Since the City's initial response to a request for property identification was submitted in 2001, the City has compiled a much more comprehensive inventory of properties that qualify for Section 4(f) status. This complete list is attached as Appendix 1.

The City requests all the alternatives be re-evaluated in light of this new information for compliance with FHWA regulations Sections 23 CFR 771.135(a)(1) and 771.135(a)(2) (constraints on alternative selection), 23 CFR 771.135(p)(1) (definition of section 4(f) properties/lands), and 23 CFR 771.135(p)(2) (definition of constructive uses). Considering these additional section 4(f) properties would substantially change the relative environmental, community, regulatory compliance, mitigation requirements, and cost rankings among the alternatives.

The draft PEIS at Section 3.16 (p. 3.16-1) (Section 4(f) Evaluation) fails to disclose why Section 4(f) is important in the alternatives evaluation and selection process. This information should be added to the revised EIS so the public and decision-makers understand the value of these properties and their role in selecting a balanced preferred alternative. Sections 23 CFR 771.135(a)(1) and 771.135(a)(2) state:

"(a)(1) the Administration may not approve the use of land from a significant publicly owned public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge or any significant historic site unless a determination is made that:

- (i) There is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the property; and
- (ii) The action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use.

(2) Supporting information must demonstrate that there are unique problems or unusual factors involved in the use of alternatives that avoid these properties or that the cost, social, economic, and environmental impacts, or community disruption resulting from, such alternatives reach extraordinary magnitudes." (emphasis added)

These are key provisions of the FHWA regulations that affect the suitability of alternatives for increasing highway capacity. The City believes a rigorous re-analysis of the section 4(f) properties associated with the City and other municipalities along the I-70 corridor will more sharply define the environmental, community, mitigation requirements, cost, and regulatory compliance differences among the alternatives. These differences must be more clearly defined and disclosed in the revised EIS and in the record of decision.

The most notable draft PEIS omission of a Section 4(f) property from the City's perspective is the failure to disclose the presence of the Idaho Springs Downtown Commercial District which is listed on the National Register (NR District). The existing proximity of the NR District to the existing highway right-of-way and future expansion plans of some highway widening alternatives make it very likely the NR District would experience significant impairments from constructive uses.

The position taken within the draft PEIS is to defer a Section 4(f) constructive use analysis to the Tier 2 process (p. 3.16-1). The City contests this and strongly requests that a constructive use analysis be performed for each of the alternative as part of the revised Tier 1 evaluation. This analysis which was not included in the impact analysis (Table 3.16-1, Tier 1 4(f) Evaluation, p. 3.16-13) is appropriate for a Tier 1 analysis and represents no greater analysis detail than has already been conducted for other resource categories evaluated in this document. For example, the draft PEIS Tier 1 assessments of potential wetland and riparian area acreage impacts and noise contour analyses for each alternative involved approximately the same level of detail and effort needed for a constructive use analysis. FHWA regulation 23 CFR 771.135(o)(1) (Section 4(f) allows this level of analysis when those impacts have a bearing on the decision to be made.

The alternatives selection and comparison implications resulting from this determination are so important to identifying and comparing acceptable corridor alternatives, that to defer this analysis to Tier 2, after a preferred alternative has been selected may either:

- Prematurely reject a viable alternative from further serious consideration as a preferred alternative or
- Fail to identify and disclose a potentially serious "constructive use" constraint on the design or cost of the preferred alternative.

The findings from this analysis would be a key environmental impact and alternative suitability discriminator.

The draft PEIS section 4(f) analysis should be revised to account for

- The additional section 4(f) properties;
- The constructive use analysis of section 4(f) properties;
- A detailed section 4(f) analysis at the Tier 1 level rather than deferring the analysis to Tier 2 because the findings have obvious implication on the selection of a programmatic preferred alternative;
- The potential additional mitigation costs associated with addressing section 4(f) compliance; and
- Potential changes on the relative ranking of the 21 alternatives.

8. The alternatives screening, grouping, and ranking processes of the draft PEIS are biased and should be re-evaluated to de-emphasize the role of assumed construction and operation costs in evaluating and grouping alternative ways of meeting the purpose and need of the proposed action. Arbitrary cost thresholds were used throughout the draft PEIS development process to bias the findings towards a pre-determined outcome favoring highway expansion or widening. Cost considerations and assumed availability of short-term funding sources were primary factors determining the suitability of alternatives to meet purpose and need. Environmental and community considerations have received only secondary or cursory considerations in the alternative screening, selection, grouping, and ranking processes.

Very competitive alternatives that perform as well or better than highway expansion alternatives in meeting purpose and need, increasing long-term highway capacity, improving mobility, avoiding or minimizing adverse environmental and community impacts, and suitable for implementation as fast as or faster than the preferred group of alternatives have been relegated to non-preferred status because assumed costs exceeded the arbitrary \$4 billion cost threshold set for this programmatic analysis.

The strong pivotal role that project cost has played in this process is inconsistent with the requirements and intent of NEPA, CEQ guidance (40 CFR Sections 1500 to 1508, Regulations for Implementing NEPA and NEPA's Forty Most Asked Questions), and FHWA guidance and policies (23 CFR Part 771, Environmental Impact and Related Procedures). The requirements of NEPA and CEQ have been misrepresented to justify the strong role that cost considerations played in screening, grouping, evaluating, and ranking the alternatives.

The draft PEIS needs to be substantially revised and the alternatives re-evaluated to place cost considerations in better balance with a programmatic view of environmental impacts, community values, mitigation needs, and capability to provide long-term corridor capacity increases.

Examples of draft PEIS statements, regulatory and policy guidance, and other events supporting these conclusions are as follows. Many other examples are available, but these examples and considerations make the point that cost played too important and a disproportionate role relative to environmental and community values. Therefore, the alternatives should be re-evaluated relying on cost as only one of several equal value criteria.

- The basis for using cost as such an important screening and ranking factor is explained by statements that define a reasonable alternative as one that is economically affordable; preferred alternatives are defined as reasonable from an economic affordability point of view. (p. ES-2)

- The basis for establishing "reasonableness" (p. ES-2) as a threshold preference condition is based on the following CEQ guidance

"In determining the scope of alternatives to be considered the emphasis is on what is 'reasonable' rather than on whether the proponent or applicant likes or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative. Reasonable alternatives include those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense, rather than simply describing from the standpoint of the applicant." (See Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's NEPA Regulations, March 23, 1981).

This guidance is open to interpretation on the role of the "economic standpoint" phrase. But key points

of this statement are (1) that it states "reasonable alternatives include..." not that "reasonable alternatives are restricted to or preferred..." and (2) "economic standpoint" does not mean the same thing as "economic affordability" as presented and applied in the draft PEIS to screen and rank the alternatives.

- Balance the use of cost and its role in the draft PEIS analytical process with the following provisions of 40 CFR 1500.2(e) (Policy) which defines "reasonable alternatives" in terms of minimizing adverse environmental effects:

"(e) Use the NEPA process to identify and assess the reasonable alternatives to proposed actions that will avoid or minimize adverse effects of these actions upon the quality of the human environment (emphasis added)."

- Balance the use of cost in the draft PEIS with the description of the purpose of an EIS and the alternatives screening process with the following provisions of 40 CFR 1502.1 (Purpose) which clearly states NEPA's and an EIS's intent to rely heavily on impacts to the human environmental impacts to make decisions about reasonable alternatives:

"...I shall provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and shall inform decision makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment..."

Neither of these key implementation provisions define or refer to the reasonableness of an alternative in terms of "economic affordability." This point is very important because the draft PEIS used the "economic affordability" test as the primary factor for placing alternatives into the "preferred alternatives" group. Just as importantly "economic affordability" was a primary screening factor in determining whether candidate alternatives and concepts survived to receive detailed analysis in the draft PEIS.

Thus if an environmentally favorable alternative failed to meet the test of "economic affordability" early in the screening process, it was eliminated from further consideration (descriptions received from CDOT and FHWA at numerous Mountain Corridor Advisory Committee (MCAC) meetings).

- The basis for establishing a \$4 billion cost threshold is arbitrary and biases the selection of a preferred alternative in favor of lower capital cost alternatives (highway expansion) that can be implemented sooner, but have higher adverse environmental impacts and mitigation costs and do not offer long-term solutions to highway capacity and mobility improvements.

- On January 12, 2005 at the MCAC meeting following release of the draft PEIS for public review and comment, the Executive Director of Colorado Department of Transportation (Mr. Tom Norton), in the presence of the new FHWA regional administrator (Mr. Dave Nichol), stated that establishing \$4 billion cost as the threshold for the preferred alternative group was his sole decision. This approach makes this important threshold value subject to much debate and question.

- Choosing a cost/funding source threshold that only considers near-term funding sources (20-years, p. 5-9) for part of the planning period to determine the suitability of long-term programmatic transportation alternatives is inconsistent with a Tier 1 programmatic analysis.

- Substantial reliance on cost considerations to screen and group alternatives in the Tier 1 draft PEIS conflicts with FHWA guidance regarding the scope of a Tier 1 programmatic EIS. Section 23 CFR 771.111(g) states:

"(g) For major transportation actions, the tiering of EISs as discussed in the CEQ regulation (40 CFR 1502.20) may be appropriate. The first tier EIS would focus on broad issues such as general location, mode choice, and area wide air quality and land use implications of the major alternatives. The second tier would address site-specific details of project impacts, costs, and mitigation measures.

Clearly this provision creates the basis for deferring extensive consideration of alternative costs to the Tier 2 analysis so such details would impair decision-makers ability to identify viable and effective long-term solutions that should be the focus of a programmatic EIS.

9. The draft PEIS public involvement process has not complied within FHWA NEPA compliance regulations and policies regarding the involvement of local governments in the decision-making process. The City has been systematically and consistently excluded from significant and/or meaningful participation in the decision-making process.

FHWA regulations at 23 CFR 771.135 identify decision-making steps when local officials are involved in determining section 4(f) resources present and the analysis of impacts to those resources. The City has not been invited to participate in these events. The applicable sections of the regulations state:

23 CFR 771.135(e) (consultation regarding status of 4(f) properties)

"e) In determining the application of section 4(f) to historic sites, the Administration, in cooperation with the applicant, will consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and appropriate local officials (emphasis added) to identify all properties on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). The section 4(f) requirements apply only to sites on or eligible for the National Register unless the Administration determines that the application of section 4(f) is otherwise appropriate.

23 CFR 771.135 (consultation regarding conduct of 4(f) constructive use analysis)

"(ii) Consultation, on the above identification and analysis, with the federal, State, and local officials having jurisdiction over the park, recreation area, refuge, or historic site." (emphasis added)

At its Office of NEPA Facilitation website at the NEPA: Project Development Process-Interagency Coordination page, FHWA described its policy for Interagency Coordination (which addresses local government) as follows:

"It is FHWA Policy to:

- Aggressively pursue communication and collaboration with our Federal, State, and local partners (emphasis added) in the transportation and environmental communities, including other modal administrations within the DOT.

- Seek new partnerships with tribal governments, businesses, transportation and environmental interests groups, resource and regulatory agencies, affected neighborhoods, and the public.

- Ensure that those historically underserved by the transportation system, including minority and low-income populations, are included in our outreach.

- Actively involve our partners and all affected parties in an open, cooperative, and collaborative process (emphasis added), beginning at the earliest planning stages and continuing through project development, construction, and operations.

- Ensure the development of comprehensive, cooperative public involvement programs during statewide and metropolitan planning and project development activities."

In light of this type of public commitment by FHWA, The City attempted to become part of the collaborative public involvement process through both FHWA and CDOT without much meaningful success. As a notable example the City in a meeting with the Executive Director of Colorado Department of Transportation (Mr. Tom Norton), on March 27, 2003, was denied its request to become a cooperating/participating agency. The letter documenting this and confirming what occurred at that meeting is attached as Appendix 2.

The public involvement process encouraging active and meaningful local government participation has not been provided to this point in the NEPA process.

#### Conclusion

The City concludes the draft PEIS has substantial flaws that impair its ability to provide an objective and unbiased disclosure of the environmental, social, and financial effects of the alternatives. Therefore, its conclusions regarding the relative abilities of the alternatives to meet the proposed action's purpose and need are significantly flawed. Both the document and the analysis process need major revisions to comply with the spirit and intent of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Federal Highway Administration's NEPA implementing regulations. The draft PEIS possesses major procedural omissions and factual errors that significantly affect the conclusions and the relative performance of the alternatives. Examples are described in the following sections.

Based on these omissions and errors, the City requests:

- Revisions of the draft PEIS document and analysis to correct these problems;

- Addition of a new alternative;

- Reassessment of all alternatives using a balanced approach that avoids or corrects the identified problems and gives equal weight to environmental, technical, social, and cost factors.

Sincerely  
Dennis Lunbery  
Mayor, City of Idaho Springs

Cc: Dave Nichol, Federal Highway Administration  
Tom Norton, Colorado Department of Transportation  
Senator Wayne Allard, U.S. Senate

Mark Udall, U.S. House  
 Senator Ken Salazar, U.S. Senate  
 Senator Joan Fitzgerald, Colorado Senate  
 Governor Bill Owens  
 Representative Tom Plant  
 Jennifer Schaufele, Denver Regional Council of Governments  
 Clear Creek Board of County Commissioners  
 Jo Ann Sorensen, Clear Creek I-70 Task Force  
 Peggy Stokstad, Clear Creek I-70 Task Force  
 U.S. EPA, Region VIII

Categorized Comment	794	City of Idaho Springs	Municipalities 2/9/2005	Attached are the comments I presented on behalf of the City of Idaho Springs at the February 9, 2005 CDOT public comment session for the I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS.	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
The City of Idaho Springs intends that these comments be included in the public record.					
My name is Dennis Lunbery. I am the Mayor of Idaho Springs. I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak here tonight.					
Tonight I want to comment about two areas related to the Draft PEIS: its inadequacy, especially with respect to Idaho Springs; and its failure to meet the requirements of NEPA. Obviously, this cannot be done in much detail in the short time allotted, but the general points I want to make will be supplemented with written comments to be provided as part of this public comment process.					
Before I begin though, I want to take this opportunity to formally extend to CDOT and FHWA the offer I made at the January 12th MCAC meeting. That is, that if the comment period was extended, as it has been, that I would be pleased to host an additional public comment session in Idaho Springs at City Hall. Since the first public comment session was held in Clear Creek County early on and people had not then had time to fully review the Draft PEIS, this additional session would provide CDOT and FHWA an opportunity to receive more complete and more fully developed input from the public, especially the Idaho Springs public. We think this is important because as you know Idaho Springs would be one of the most significantly impacted areas under any of the preferred grouping of alternatives.					
It is the position of the City of Idaho Springs that the alternatives in the preferred grouping are based on our current understanding of the complex draft PEIS all inadequate and inappropriate for our community and the most critical reaches of the I-70 corridor. They are inadequate and inappropriate because they do not meet the specified needs of improved accessibility and mobility nor do they meet the need of decreasing congestion. They also do not appear to meet the purposes of environmental sensitivity or respect for community values.					
Others have noted in their comments the shortcomings of the Draft PEIS in its analysis of mobility impacts and economic disruption and we agree with those comments. We believe that if the preferred alternatives are carried forward they will have significant negative impacts on the economy, the environment, the historic character and the quality of life for residents of Idaho Springs and Clear Creek County. In addition, we think that the Draft PEIS fails to meet the requirements that it should under NEPA, CEQ, and FHWA regulations. Here are some examples:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under 40 CFR 1502.1 relating to purpose, it states in part that the EIS "shall provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and shall inform decision makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment. Statements shall be concise, clear, and to the point ..." This is not the case with this Draft PEIS.</li> <li>• Under 40 CFR 1502.2 it states that "Environmental impact statements shall be analytic rather than encyclopedic". This PEIS is encyclopedic rather than analytic.</li> <li>• Under 40 CFR 1502.14 relating to alternatives including the proposed action, it states that for environmental consequences "it (the EIS) should present the</li> </ul>					
environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decision maker and the public." We do believe the format of the environmental impacts as currently presented do not sharply define the issues and trade-offs so a clear basis for choice is provided to the City and other decision-makers. The contrary is the case.					
The City also believes that mitigation options and commitments are not addressed in sufficient detail to understand the relative advantages and disadvantages associated with each alternative. More detail is required in the PEIS. Details should not be differed until the Tier 2 environmental documentation. The City believes a very strong commitment and greater detail are required in this 20 to 50-year planning document. We would refer you to Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council, 490 U.S. 332, (1989) which indicates that "[m]itigation [must] be discussed in sufficient detail to ensure that environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated...."; also Holy Cross Wilderness Fund v. Madigan, in the 10th Cir. in 1992; and Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Service, in 9th Cir. in 1998) say that "mere listing of mitigation measures is insufficient to qualify as the reasoned discussion required by NEPA" and in Idaho Sporting Congress v. Thomas, in the 9th Cir. in 1998 it was noted that "Without analytical detail to support the proposed mitigation measures, we are not persuaded that they amount to anything more than a 'mere listing' of good management practices". Lastly, in many published FHWA policy and guidance documents (notably the FHWA Environmental Policy Statement of 1994), the commitment to implement strong mitigation program is a prevailing theme. The detailed steps needed to ensure an effective mitigation program are missing from this environmental analysis.					
In summary the City of Idaho Springs believes a significant re-evaluation of the alternatives proposed for meeting the stated purpose and need is required. This reevaluation should objectively assess the suggested changes in one or more alternatives that will be submitted at the close of the public review period. Based on a revised analysis, the City believes the alternatives assigned to the preferred grouping would change substantially.					
We also think that the Draft PEIS fails to meet the requirements it must under NEPA, CEQ, and FHWA regulations and we believe there are legal precedents to support this belief.					

Categorized Comment	306	Lyssy, Fred	Municipalities 2/9/2005	My name is Fred Lyssy. I am the mayor of Silver Plume.	Transcripts
I've been to a couple of these forums before and have expressed our concerns in Silver Plume about a number of things, including the footprint, the width and how the -- its potential impact on our town, the rockfall along the Georgetown/Silver Plume Hill, the adverse impact on our very few businesses during the construction period when the traffic may or may not even be able to get off and come to our businesses, I've discussed the inability of emergency vehicles to access our community during the construction period and during periods of closure. And I've addressed some water quality, but not nearly as accurately as was done earlier tonight and I appreciate those comments.					
Tonight I'd like to talk a little bit about the noise. As I dug into this study a little bit more, I looked at that boundary that -- the blue line is drawn to show where the noise will eventually go. And because our town, as are most of the towns along the corridor, is pretty much parallel to the highway, it would appear to me that more than half of our town citizens are going to live within a high-noise zone and that mitigation forces are not yet addressed at this point. Yet if I look at the alternatives, some of those alternatives certainly address things that include provisions that would eliminate some of that noise. So I think that we need to be very careful about how noise will be handled in our small community. 66 decibels to more than half of our population is not acceptable.					
And one thing I guess probably won't come out until the Tier II is -- and it's in the minimal-action alternatives, is the relocation of the interchange in our community. We are working closely with the Colorado Historic Society to make sure the new railroad operator is going to be successful, and a lot of traffic accesses it through our interchange. So we've got to be very careful about where it's moved and how that will impact the railroad as well as the businesses. And, actually, if I were to prioritize, I would say the businesses and the railroad traffic. So I just ask your indulgence in addressing these issues.					

Categorized Comment	141	Lyssy, Fred	Municipalities 1/12/2005	I'm Fred Lyssy, the mayor of Silver Plume. I'm going to make several general comments. I will give more specific comments as a municipality. I doubt they'll be quite as sensitive as the basic document from which it will be commenting.	Transcripts
I would like to not go over the environmental justice issue that one of our citizens so eloquently stated, but I do have a couple of things we would like to get into the record.					
First of all, I-70 severely blighted our community when it was built years ago. The footprint that's there today is relatively narrow compared to what I think this selected alternative might end up presenting. And I think that it will be a significant impact on our community.					
On the south side of the road, we've got the historical society and the Narrow Gauge Railroad. We can't disrupt that. So you've got to go to the north side of the road for the 120-footprint, plus 15 feet of disturbance -- construction disturbance zone. So, consequently, it would appear -- and I can't find it in the document anywhere. It would appear that homes are probably going to be lost. We're going to displace people, we're going to increase noise, automobile fumes, et cetera.					
The second item is: We had a resident from our community killed at Georgetown/Silver Plume Hill recently. It appears, from what I can see in the document, that there is not very effective rockfall mitigation in the plan. Now, I've heard rumor, I can't find it in the document, that instead of cutting further into the mountain and removing more rock, that the intent is to cantilever out over the valley. I'm sure					

Georgetown will appreciate Argentine Street being buried.

The third item I'd like to mention is the -- one minute, I got it -- that we have no frontage road in Silver Plume to the rest of the community. If we need groceries, if we need medical care, everything has to be done on that dang highway. The construction impact in the document says there will be "periodic closures," meaning we won't be able to get anyone's fire trucks to our community. This is a severe concern to our citizens.

And then the final thing I'd like to mention is that the REMI model is a complete mystery to me. None of the documentation in there regarding the economics can be substantiated, or, frankly, in my case, believed. So I'm very concerned about the way that's done. And I think more data is required for that.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	160	Lyssy, Fred	Municipalities	1/15/2005	My name is Fred Lyssy. I have two addresses, one in Silver Plume and one in Golden. My wife owns a business in Golden, but I'm the mayor of Silver Plume, so I spend an inordinate amount of time on I-70 between those two.	Transcripts
	<p>As the mayor, we have several concerns in Silver Plume, some of which I've expressed to you before, like the footprint of the selected alternative, concern over losing another citizen due to the rockfall on the Georgetown-Silver Plume Hill, what we think would be economic consequences during the 15-year construction period, and our sales taxes, and noise.</p> <p>But today, I'd like to talk about water resources. Silver Plume's municipal water system is the first municipal on Clear Creek. Clear Creek is a source of our Rocky Mountain springwater, water for a lot of municipalities. And in Silver Plume we kind of consider ourselves as the keepers of those head waters of Clear Creek.</p> <p>And I'd like to suggest to the mayors and citizens here in Jefferson County -- and the citizens that we carefully consider the impact of those I-70 alternatives to the water that we're going to be drinking. I don't believe that, from what I can gather so far, the Tier I document really gives us a sufficient level of detail so that we can really select a preferred alternative. And there's a couple of reasons I say this.</p> <p>First, if one of the preferred alternatives, the eight lanes, six, or traffic -- two for buses were selected, there's a huge amount of fresh cut and fill, most all of it pretty much in the heavily mineralized Clear Creek County, and that will adversely affect our waters, old mill sites, currently covered tailings are going to be disturbed and contaminants are going to be exposed for entry into the water.</p> <p>Nine miles of this new roadway will contaminate our water in Silver Plume, but nearly 30 miles, from the Eisenhower Tunnel all the way to Floyd Hill, will introduce contaminants into Jefferson County's water system. Cirque and stormwater and winter maintenance runoff, that same eight-lane alternative provides a 62 percent increase in sand and 103 percent increase in deicer products. So my concern is, how can we select a preferred alternative until we know all of the details and what the true impact is going to be?</p> <p>The second thing is, we want to ask people to consider driving through the cone zone for the next 15 years, what that's going to do. I think that the people of Jefferson County have spoken loud and clear by passing FasTracks. And if we can connect FasTracks with another transit system, we can accommodate the citizens of Jefferson County readily.</p> <p>So we would like a very careful consideration of a transit system connecting with FasTracks.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>					

Categorized Comment	484	Town of Silver Plume	Municipalities	4/26/2005	<p>Town of Silver Plume Drawer F Silver Plume, CO. 80476 Phone &amp; Fax: (303) 569-2363</p> <p>April 26, 2005</p> <p>David Nichol, Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Ave. Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Dear Mr. Nichol,</p> <p>The Town of Silver Plume, as a consulting party to the Section 106 review of the I70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) and component of the Georgetown Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District, has reviewed the Draft PEIS. The Board of Trustees would like consideration of the following comments in the discussions among the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), the State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) on both the Tier 1 consultation and Programmatic Agreement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Area of Potential Effect (APE). Silver Plume agrees with the definition of the APE as the viewshed of I70. The mountainsides that define Silver Plume's narrow valley contain the most significant mining sites in the Landmark District. Two major historic roadbeds, the 7.30 Mine Road and the Argentine Central Railroad Grade head up the mountainsides on both sides of the town. Noise to, and views from, these resources are impacts that should be considered.</li> <li>2. Reconnaissance Survey. The Revised Reconnaissance Survey indicated 90 structures in Silver Plume that have not yet been inventoried but are likely to be contributing elements to the Landmark District. These structures and the mining sites adjacent to Silver Plume should be evaluated for eligibility prior to the final determination of any Tier 2 action. That evaluation can be addressed in the Programmatic Agreement.</li> <li>3. Assessment of effects. The Executive Summary page ES-37 concludes, "At the Tier 1 conceptual level of study, direct effects on historic properties (including districts and historic areas) in the Corridor have the potential to be avoided and minimized." The Town of Silver Plume does not agree with that determination. The Section 4(f) law quoted on page 3-16-1 states: "Constructive use occurs when the transportation project does not incorporate land from a Section 4 (f) resource, but the project's proximity impacts are so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired...." Constructive use at that level is a direct effect and must be considered at Tier 1. Constructive use is apparent with the projected noise, visual, access and physical effects in Silver Plume. An alternative is to be identified which "avoids and minimizes harm" to the historic resource. This standard has not been met. Tier 2 is too late as the alternative will all ready be chosen.</li> </ol> <p>Page 3.15.3 of the PEIS states "Criteria for addressing effects on historic resources were developed with concurrence from the Committee". Silver Plume did not participate in any "committee" which concurred with any of the effects We were talked "at", not "with." The town's comments on the effects are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Physical: Physical is not simply buildings. The setting of the Landmark District is an important physical attribute of the District. The relocation of an exit alters the physical appearance of the District in addition to dramatically changing the access to the Georgetown Loop Historic Mining and Railroad Park. Huge noise walls through town and retaining walls along the Georgetown Loop Railroad grade will alter the physical setting. Overshadowing of structures and yards is a physical taking. The Draft PEIS indicates that all alternatives have the same physical impact. That does not even make sense.</li> <li>b. Noise: Silver Plume is overwhelmed in I70 noise now. The 66 decibel level makes outdoor activities impossible, yet outdoor activities are at the heart of the appreciation of the historic resources. The PEIS indicates the noise will increase and 66 decibels will cover most of the town. The only remedies deemed affordable in the PEIS are noise walls and noise berms. Horizontal and vertical alignment shifts are mentioned and rejected as too costly. Noise walls would have huge negative visual impacts and would serve to bounce sound further up the mountainsides. A sound level of 56 decibels referred to as Activity Level A would be more appropriate for this historic setting.</li> <li>c. Visual: Visual effects do not take into consideration the impact of noise wall mitigation in Silver Plume. The noise walls will cut off the views from one side of town to the other. The views of significant historic structures will be eliminated from the passing motorist. Section 4(p) of the Transportation Act states that the elimination of such views constitutes a constructive use. The visual impact of horizontal widening is minimized in the PEIS but will be the major impact from Silver Plume's mountainsides. The visual impacts of highway widening in Silver Plume with all its additional mitigation far surpasses the sight of an elevated guideway on flexible alignment which could run along the mountainside. The Table on 3-15-17 is wrong and misleading.</li> <li>d. Cumulative: The cumulative impact discussion in the PEIS in Chapter 4, page 4-35, fails to acknowledge the disastrous impact of the initial construction of I70 on Silver Plume. The Town was bisected and decimated. The initial construction of I70 paid no heed to historic resources or community life. It is not a mistake we should make twice. The Summary of Cumulative impacts, Table 2-27, simply says "Impacts from indirect disturbance (noise and visual impacts) to historic districts and landmark areas (mining related) to areas previously displaced/disturbed by original I70 construction would cause cumulative effects." It is time to go the other way and mitigate the past in building for the future.</li> <li>e. Construction: The limited discussion of construction impacts does not include any discussion of the</li> </ol>	Written

fragile nature of historic resources in areas where construction may include blasting and excessive noise. The potential takings within a construction zone are not addressed.

4. Comparison of alternatives. There is no true comparison of alternatives. Table 2-26 on Page 2-124 uses incomplete and manipulated criteria. The Section 4(f) line, which includes historic resources, simply says "similar" across all alternatives. The effects of all alternatives are not "similar".

The preferred alternatives described in the PEIS have the greatest adverse impacts on the Landmark District. The bus in guideway and the standard design six lane widening at 65 mph, 55 mph or reversible lanes, have the substantial noise and construction impacts. Their visual impacts analysis is marred by the approach that nothing horizontal is visible. As Tables 2-25, 2-26, 2-27 describe, combination alternatives have the greatest adverse impacts not only to the historic resources, but also to environmental sensitivity, community values and cumulative effects. According to Table ES-4 all preferred alternatives have the most substantial adverse effects during the proposed 15 year construction period.

The purpose and need statement of the PEIS states that the "need" of increased capacity, improved mobility and decreased congestion will be addressed in a manner which provides for the environmental sensitivity, community values (including historic resources), improvements to safety and ability to implement. Of these, only ability to implement has been utilized in determining the preferred alternatives. This is inappropriate.

5. Mitigation. How can we have standard design parameters and Context Sensitive Design at the same moment? The mitigation does not identify areas that are particularly sensitive in the realm of environmental or community values. The individual mitigation sections define a number of mitigation strategies (e.g. noise wall, noise berms, horizontal and vertical alignment adjustments,) and then eliminate all that represent additional cost.

The Town of Silver Plume is requesting a balance between the need and purposes for this federal undertaking as prescribed by law. It is the Tier 1 decision that will create the effects. Please have recognition of the Landmark District and the Town of Silver Plume in making the Tier 1 decision. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Fred Lyssy  
Mayor

cc: The Honorable Wayne Allard, U.S. Senator  
The Honorable Ken Salazar, U.S. Senator  
The Honorable Mark Udall, U.S. Representative  
Colorado Senate President Joan Fitz-Gerald  
Colorado Representative Tom Plant  
Georgianna Contiguglia, State Historic Preservation Officer  
Dan Corson, Army Pallante, State Office of Historic Preservation  
Carol Legard, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation  
Lysa Wegman-French, National Park Service  
James Lindberg, National Trust for Historic Preservation  
Cecelia Joy, CDOT, Project Manager  
Mary Ann Naber, FHWA, Federal Preservation Officer  
Ann Prinzlaff, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation

Categorized Comment	682	Town of Silver Plume	Municipalities	5/20/2005	Town of Silver Plume Drawer F Silver Plume, CO, 80476 Phone & Fax (303) 569-2363 E-Mail - townofsilverplume@msn.com	Written
<p>May 20, 2005</p> <p>Colorado Department Of Transportation Region 1 18500 E. Colfax Ave. Aurora, Colorado 80011</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>The Board of Trustees of the Town of Silver Plume has been carefully evaluating I-70 PEIS. Thank you for extending the comment period to May 24th; the additional time was necessary. Also, thank you for providing printed copies instead of only electronic copies of both Volumes I and II.</p> <p>The Town government has conducted two meetings for citizens — one in early January during which citizens were briefed on the contents of the study, and a second meeting as part of the I-70 coalition. The Town meeting hosted by representatives of the I-70 coalition, was attended by Mr. Pinkerton of your organization. A relatively large percentage of our citizens attended this meeting and asked discerning questions and provided acute comments. The Town Board has used this input from citizens as well as from community meetings and other sources in preparing our response to the PEIS.</p> <p>We appreciate your careful study of our comments and look forward to a response to our requests.</p> <p>Thank you. Fred Lyssy, Mayor</p> <p>Cc: The Honorable Wayne Allard, U.S. Senate The Honorable Ken Salazar, U.S. Senate The Honorable Mark Udall, U.S. Representative Colorado Senate President Joan Fitz-Gerald Colorado Representative Tom Plant Mary Ann Naber, FHWA</p> <p>Town of Silver Plume I-70 PEIS Comments</p> <p>1. General Comments:</p> <p>a. Process Used for Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS)</p> <p>Much discussion has centered around the use of a Tier I and Tier II approach to performing an Environmental Impact Statement. The Town of Silver Plume does not have National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) experts on staff and cannot afford to hire such. But, the Town believes that process used to select a range of preferred alternatives without understanding the environmental consequences seems to violate the intent of the NEPA. The Tier I process that produced the I-70 Draft PEIS derives conclusions of "Preferred Alternatives", screening out most others on the basis of cost. Even safety and mortality seem to be factors that are ignored in the decision process.</p> <p>Because environmental consequences of the alternatives are not understood (by either CDOT or the Town of Silver Plume), we believe that a rational selection cannot be made. However, given the amount of time and money spent by CDOT it is assumed that the process will not be changed.</p> <p>Therefore, the Town of Silver Plume is "trusting" that CDOT will take the requests contained herein and carefully incorporate them in all future I-70 planning work. This is especially important to the citizens of our town with respect to mitigation of the many factors discussed herein.</p> <p>b. I-70 Coalition:</p> <p>Silver Plume is a member of the I-70 coalition and has fully participated in the activities of the Coalition. The Town endorses the Coalition Alternative proposed in their comments to the PEIS. The alternative endorses a multi-modal approach including early development of transit, selected highway improvements, aviation improvements, development of alternative routes to relieve demand for the I-70 corridor, and improvement of pedestrian and bicycle paths. It is believed that this approach will provide a long-range solution to improved traffic capacity. And, by using context sensitive design, the improvements to I-70 could be made such that travelers can experience memorable that will attract tourism for our State.</p> <p>A most important aspect of the I-70 coalition process, and one that is wholly supported by the Town of Silver Plume, is the idea that planning must be more comprehensive and visionary. The Town of Silver Plume fully supports a long-range planning process wherein our immediate descendants will not be agonizing over highway widening as is currently on-going in 2005. Early organizing, planning, and programming for a transit system must start immediately! In the meantime, selective highway improvements, construction of alternate routes and provision for non-motorized corridors can relieve current capacity restrictions.</p> <p>c. Societal Impact:</p> <p>The preferred alternatives all involve paving of a minimum of six lanes through Silver Plume. While there are specific concerns, it may be appropriate to start with a more global/societal view of this activity. What are the societal gains from that accomplishment? What are the losses? That is, has a verifiable cost/benefit analysis been performed of adding thousands of additional people and cars to the congestion or will it be included in Tier II of the PEIS? For your consideration, the cost side of the cost/benefit equation must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increased emissions,</li> </ul>						

- increased accidents and other breakdowns requiring response,
- increased noise and other stress on wildlife - both floral and faunal
- increased crowding and other pressures on man-made and natural recreational facilities,
- increased demands and pressure on non-highway infrastructure like electricity, natural gas, water, hospitals, communication,
- degrading Silver Plume's value in representing for future generations significant aspects of the nation's history, and
- lowering the property values during the 15-year construction period, to the serious disadvantage of any resident needing or wanting to sell property.

It may be that such a cost benefit analysis would conclude that there is no justification for increasing the number of cars involved in the congestion, but the argument that it is desirable to service an increase in the number of people. The PEIS logic for this project is based upon Denver Metro area population increase of 47% by 2025. But, why are mountain communities (Silver Plume and Clear Creek County) expected to ameliorate Denver's problem? Actually, if I-70 capacity were not increased, it might help slow population growth — a problem being addressed by Denver government and the State legislature.

The motivation for this project, apparently, is to protect the growth and profitability of recreational interests, in particular, the ski areas. However, one very important fact has been overlooked. There is not one new ski area or even expansion slated for development. With the current environmental atmosphere there is slim possibility for developing additional skiing acreage. The ski areas are already at maximum capacity (both skiing area and parking) on the weekends. Other recreational activity sites, such as camping and hiking, are also at capacity.

The current highway provides sufficient capacity needed to overrun the Western Slope with more people than there is infrastructure or recreational areas to handle them. The only apparent economic reason for this highway expansion is to make the trip from DIA to the ski areas convenient enough to keep destination skiers from going elsewhere. This amounts to using taxpayer money to pay for various ski corporation marketing and operations.

#### d. Intangible Cost Factors — A new paradigm needed.

The philosophic and economic underpinnings of federally-supported highway construction have traditionally been quite narrowly defined, and the existing PEIS is in fact a latter-day incarnation of that 1950ish philosophy and economics. In no small measure what is at stake in the I-70 issue is the entire future of transportation and transportation decision-making in this country. However, in the 21st century a different paradigm must be used for evaluating transportation projects. It appears from this PEIS, that the muscle of the trucking and highway lobbies, the push by private recreational interests, the political climate, and finally, the reluctance of highway engineers to consider (or re-educate themselves) of other transportation alternatives is driving solutions.

A socially and fiscally responsible impact statement should also consider intangible factors. Among those factors are:

- Automobiles consuming oil products that must be imported, thus contributing to a foreign trade imbalance.
- The psychological, emotional stress on drivers and passengers
- Automotive impacts to community residents (health, noise, other)
- The price of oil escalated for the period of the study including both the costs of asphalt for construction, maintenance, and re-paving
- Suppressed demand for recreational travel, given expensive fuels.

Such intangibles may be difficult to cost out, but they are indisputably real, and I believe that an approximation of costs can be reliably proposed, if only on the basis of some scientifically supportable hypothesis. (And lest anyone balk at the notion of reasoning from hypothesis, remember that this entire PEIS is a large and extended exercise in hypothesis.)

If costs like rail/highway maintenance, emissions, accidents and other health/medical costs and so forth are included in the cost effectiveness analysis, the difference between construction costs for the two modes will be significantly narrowed if not eliminated.

#### e. Alternatives recommended for consideration:

Assuming that there is acceptable justification for increasing the number of people—as distinguished from cars—entering and leaving the near western slope, clearly that goal can be reached by either of two alternatives:

Constructing a Nogoya-type "train," or some transit system analogous to it. It is asserted that such an option is out because "we" cannot afford the construction costs. I suggest that the PEIS should be required to compare and contrast the transportation costs exclusive of construction of the two modes of moving the people (cars and "train"). I believe it is widely accepted that on a per capita per mile basis the train mode is significantly more cost effective.

Another idea that falls in the "visionary Solution" category would be to improve alternate routes, such the US 285 and 50 corridor from Denver to Grand Junction. This would take some pressure off I-70 plus lend some much-needed economic support to an area that really needs it.

#### 2. Silver Plume Specific concerns:

##### a. Expansion of footprint

The current I-70 footprint severely divided the Town of Silver Plume when built in 1960. Houses had to be moved or demolished and property owners were displaced from their homes. The proposed expansion of I-70 as defined in the preferred alternatives of the PEIS will need to expand the highway footprint considerably. While there is a comment that no structures are to be affected, it seems improbable given that engineering design work has not yet begun, thus the specific roadway footprint is unknown. The south side of the current interstate at the east edge of Silver Plume presently has both Clear Creek and the Colorado Historic Railroad for the tracks, loading station, and other structures. It is assumed that because of the historic nature of those facilities, no disturbance of the railroad area is contemplated (or possible) and that Clear Creek would be either put underground or channeled in some manner. However, widening the footprint to potentially 124 feet, plus a fifteen foot construction disturbance zone on either side has the potential to cause adjustment of the route northward. Specific concerns with this activity are:

The potential loss of homes (or as a minimum, the beneficial loss of use of the homes) for highway right-of-way.

The potential for limitation of Clear Creek flow, possibly causing flooding, by a constraining box culvert in the event of a 500-year flood event.

Accordingly, the Town of Silver Plume specifically requests that no expansion beyond current highway footprint be undertaken inside the Town limits.

##### b. Environmental Concerns:

###### 1. Rockfall Hazards

In the past couple of years, Silver Plume lost one of its citizens due to rockfall on Georgetown/Silver Plume Hill. There is no alternative for Silver Plume citizens to access schools, grocery stores, gasoline stations, pharmacy, and other facilities needed for day-to-day activities. No access road exists; only the main lanes of I-70.

Current rockfall mitigation work is very much appreciated, but further construction activities on the incline will potentially disturb rock and cause further rockfall. Table 3.7.2 of the PEIS indicates a high severity index for all alternatives, except AGS. From the Silver Plume residents perspective, this is a "pacifier" factor for selection of the preferred alternative, given the safety of our citizens. A context sensitive design, using and colonnaded, and covered lanes would provide expansion of traffic flow, but more importantly will provide protection from rockfall hazard.

The sketch below provides a conceptual view of such an approach.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that any alternative selected include action to preclude further disturbance of the rock to minimize rockfall potential and that lanes be covered to deflect rock away from highway travel lanes.

###### 2. Disturbance of Clear Creek Channel

Recreation — Clear Creek is a major feature of our community setting. It is used for recreation activities and is the source of drinking water for the community. Widening of the highway potentially will require moving the channel or otherwise disturbing it. It is reputed that it took "years" for the fish characteristics of the stream to return to levels somewhat similar to those existing prior to building I-70 in the early 1960s. Paragraph 3.4.4.2 of the PEIS promises active measures be taken such as cantilevered sections and elevated sections which are imperative from the perspective of Silver Plume residents.

Channel Disturbance — In the vicinity of milepost 225, all of the Preferred Alternatives which include moving the Silver Plume exit to that location will impact the channel of Clear Creek. Similarly, all the Preferred Alternatives will impact the channel at milepost 226. The PEIS acknowledges those facts, and defers any discussion of mitigation to Tier 2, (page 3.4-29 for a generalized discussion of impacts, mitigation, and deferral to Tier 2) when more detailed engineering design will make it clearer exactly what mitigation(s) will be required or desirable. It is not possible to express significant comments on the adverse impact without knowing CDOT's findings regarding the disturbance, Selection of an alternative without knowing the environmental impact is a flawed process!

Many of Silver Plume's citizens favor an alternative that includes the AGS alternative, which has



significantly less impact on channel disturbance at milepost 226 and no channel disturbance at milepost 225 than do the preferred alternatives.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that stronger consideration be given to alternatives that have the least impact to Clear Creek.

### 3. Noise

Highway traffic noise has been a continuing concern for the Town of Silver Plume for many years. As CDOT records will indicate, the Town has been seeking remediation for this problem over many years. The fact that the noise wall was constructed at the West Bound entry ramp is appreciated. In addition, the current construction of noise berms at both the East and West end of town is also appreciated. However, these measures only partially remedy the problem.

The PEIS appears to have chosen the 66-dB(A) level as a standard for noise in the National Historic Landmark District. Table 3.12.2 provides noise abatement criteria based on a description of Activity Category. It is the opinion of Silver Plume, that a level of serenity is important to the purpose of the area as a National Historic Landmark District. Accordingly, the Town should in Activity Category A with an Leq of 56 db. The National Historic Landmark District is dependent upon heritage tourism and outdoor recreation. It is not uncommon for walking tours in the Town and a surrounding noise level of 66 dB is inappropriate. The Town believes that the Activity Level A is the appropriate designation to be applied and requests that any mitigation measures in the future be such that noise is limited to that level.

Regrettably, because the PEIS addresses noise at the 66 decibel noise level it shows noise boundary shift from the current edge of the Right-Of-Way into approximately one-half of the occupied area of the Town. This is portrayed in Figure 3-12-12. There are no specifics on how remediation will be implemented; it is anticipated remediation will be done in Tier II of the study. As indicated above, the Town of Silver Plume does not accept the Activity Category B with its 66 db Leq. Given the lack of engineering expertise within our limited Town resources to develop a list of remediation alternatives, it is the considered opinion of our Town that enormous sound walls will pose major adverse impacts themselves (for example, sun screening to preclude winter snow melt, visual obstruction to businesses). The adverse sound barrier impacts need to be included in the cost factors used in the PEIS.

An example of a cut and cover construction that could be accommodated in Silver Plume, contained within the existing roadway footprint, that would channelize noise upward to reduce impact to local residents is shown in the conceptual drawing below. It may be unnecessary to place a cover on the channel; CDOT engineering would no doubt understand the complexities of noise lowering and expanding traffic lanes.

It is suggested that a study be conducted to determine whether the roadway through the Town of Silver Plume can be placed below current grade to channelize noise upward. This option may be less expensive than construction of different sound walls to limit noise to the 56 db level. Further, it may reduce the steepness of the grade on the final portion of Georgetown/Silver Plume Hill.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that a serious examination of implements Activity Level A at the 56 db level be applied to that portion of the route that traverses the National Historic Landmark District.

### 4. Water Quality

The Town of Silver Plume's municipal water system is the first of many other municipalities' water systems that rely upon Clear Creek as the source of our clear Rocky Mountain water. Silver Plume (along with the other municipalities in Clear Creek County) is cognizant of our role as "Keepers of the Headwaters." The concerns expressed in this section apply to others who rely upon Clear Creek as the source of water that Colorado citizens will be drinking.

The CDOT PEIS analysis has performed a credible analysis of the environmental impacts associated with water resources in Section 3.4. Table 3.4-18, Summary of Winter Maintenance Impacts, discloses rather significant issues. These are increases associated with selection of "the" preferred alternative for reaching a Record of Decision.

The Town of Silver Plume is has a very strong interest in ensuring our drinking waters can continue to be kept pristine. The PEIS preferred alternatives suggest that CDOT is proceeding toward selection of alternatives with the most significant impacts. The Town of Silver Plume wishes to express four factors:

a. Winter maintenance runoff. — An increase sand impact in Clear Creek ranging between 58% (6 lane highway — 65 mph) and 72% (reversible HOV/HOT lanes) is troubling. An increase of deicer products ranging from 72% (Dual mode or diesel bus in guideway) to 103% (combination 6 lane with bus in guideway) is even more troubling.

b. Storm water runoff significantly diminishes the water quality of Clear Creek, our Towns drinking water source. The quote on page 3.4-19 (right side of page, 3rd paragraph) that the FHWA model cannot effectively evaluate the complex mechanisms that govern the chemical and physical interactions between highway runoff pollutants and the receiving water are especially troubling for our Town. Deferring further study until Tier 2, after potentially selecting an alternative that has the greatest water degrading impact, is a travesty. The Town of Silver Plume requests that an analysis be performed prior to the selection that will be documented in the Record of Decision so that the least impact solution has a chance of consideration.

c. Citizens of Silver Plume have observed an increasingly sandy bottom is developing in the portions of Clear Creek that run through Town. Regrettably, this is happening at present when only half the amount of pavement that would exist with some of the preferred alternatives. Keeping even more lanes clear of snow and ice will add to the diminished stream quality.

d. If an eight lane alternative (six for traffic and two for busses) were selected, a large amount of fresh cut and fill in heavily mineralized Clear Creek County will have to occur. Old mill sites and covered tailings will be disturbed and contaminants will be exposed for entry into our water system. The preferred alternatives suggest that nine miles of new roadway (EJMT to Silver Plume with climbing lanes, etc.) will contaminate Silver Plumes water source. But, the nearly thirty additional miles of cut and fill for pavement (from Silver Plume to Floyd Hill) will introduce significantly contaminants into the water source for the Standley Lake users.

The question that must be addressed is, "How can a selection of a preferred alternative be made, without a complete understanding of the unknown consequences to our scarce water resources. The consequences of construction, storm water and winter maintenance products is anticipated to be severe.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that stronger consideration be given to alternatives that have the least impact to water quality of Clear Creek.

### 5. Millsite Contamination

Silver Plume is the heart of several mill sites having mercury, cyanide, arsenic, and other stuff buried on the site, plus Brownville, all comprising a historic mosaic that is protected from constructive use. If Clear Creek County were a fortified castle, Silver Plume is the Keep. The mill residuals are not moving, but they pose a risk if disturbed. Page 3-8.5 of the PEIS acknowledges mill sites, but appears to be very shallow in analysis or understanding of the complexity of the residuals.

The Town of Silver Plume hereby requests that a more detailed analysis be conducted prior to selection of a preferred alternative so that an adequate understanding of the mill site disturbances is known.

### c. Construction Impact:

#### 1. Geologic Disturbance

Silver Plume has two areas of potential rockfall that are considered "perilous" by the Colorado Geologic Survey. These are documented on the Geologic Survey in the following language

"Two large rock masses loom precariously on the mountainside above the town of Silver Plume. One imperils the post office; the other a saloon; and anyone or anything in their path. Natural processes are at work and eventually both of the rock slabs will fall. Mitigation measures could include moving objects in their paths or deliberately initiating the falls to avoid loss of life. The town has been notified of the hazards and is contemplating the solutions." (Note — the post office has since relocated and the building is now a private residence.)

It is a concern of the Town government and its citizens, that construction activities conducted by CDOT will disturb the rock masses and either precipitate or hasten the potential fall. This PEIS response is an official notification of CDOT of the rockfall potential that may imperil both life and property in the Town.

#### 2. Silver Plume-Georgetown Bike Trail:

Although recognized in the PEIS, the Silver Plume-Georgetown Bike trail, a 1.5 mile trail that closely parallels I-70 needs further understanding. It was built with private donations, grant money, and other funds. The loss of the path is not acceptable.

The PEIS does not list the bike path's functions:

- recreational biking and walking
- emergency alternate route in the event of I-70 closure along Plume Hill a.k.a the Georgetown Incline
- walking trail for Silver Plume workers without cars to get to and from employment in Georgetown (for those who use it in this manner, the probable loss of even a walking path constitutes an adverse impact).

The following correction should be noted. While the third bulleted function above has had limited

applicability, it has clearly been a viable and real function. Accordingly, the PEIS should acknowledge that the bike trail serves three distinct functions. In addition the PEIS acknowledges that all of the Preferred Alternatives will disrupt the existing bike trail. It states that mitigation of that impact will "maintain continuity of trail through realignment of affected segment." (Pages M-8 through M-10.)

To evaluate the PEIS comments, a local citizen has walked the trail for the purpose of comparing the additional footprint required by each of the Preferred Alternatives with the actual topography along the bike trail. It is his opinion that at three easily identifiable locations each of the Preferred Alternatives will not only obliterate the surface available to the trail, but will also require the addition of retaining walls. It is estimated that the walls would need to be comparable to those being added to the Guanella Pass road simply to accommodate the Alternatives.

Although no direct statements referencing retaining walls appear in the PEIS, references to "Large-scale" and "Moderate-scale" retaining walls between mileposts 226 and 228 (Georgetown Hill essentially) in the section devoted to Visual Resources in the appendices (see page L-30) do exist. It is concluded that a necessity for retaining walls is validated by the PEIS.

It is certainly possible that the retaining walls could be built wide enough to accommodate the roadway, in addition to the 8–10 foot width needed to achieve "realignment of (the) affected segment(s)" of the bike path. As it happens, it is feared that the cost of constructing such retaining walls strongly suggests that the addition of 8-10 feet to accommodate "realignment" of a bike path will in actual practice preclude such a mitigation, and that the bike path will eventually be obliterated without mitigation.

It is suggested that more explicit detail be provided. For example, the PEIS should be revised to state that the disruptions of the bike path can potentially be mitigated by realigning the affected segments onto retaining walls that will in any case need to be constructed to accommodate any of the Preferred Alternatives. The retaining walls would be widened to the extent necessary for the Preferred Alternative so that they accommodate realignment of the bike path."

It should be noted that a retaining wall in this section should be kept in character with the Historic Railroad Park through which it passes. The park, a property of the Colorado Historical Society, has retaining walls supporting earthen embankments adjacent to the rail bed. Any retaining wall built in the vicinity must not look like a 2005 (or later) creation; if it does, it will be out of character with the properties through which it passes.

This statement in the PEIS would acknowledge explicitly what seems to be already accepted and incontrovertible engineering reality.

To further the argument, the loss of the bike path either eliminates cycling beyond Georgetown or forces bicyclers onto the interstate. If the latter results, safety issues MUST be addressed in the PEIS. And if only the former (there is an explicit prohibition against bikes on all interstate highways, specifically noted to be in effect at the tunnel), that too should be addressed. If you dead-end things at Georgetown, won't there be significant impacts to the cycling and hiking recreation offered at present in the I-70 corridor?

More generally, does the PEIS address impacts to TRADITIONAL modes of TRANSPORTATION (walking, hiking, horseback, etc.)—as well as recreation—throughout the portion of the project for which highway paving is preferred? And is CDOT proposing inadvertently to define out of existence, in perpetuity, such traditional modes dating to prehistory in the portion of the valley between Georgetown and Silver Plume? If so, the PEIS must acknowledge and justify that CDOT decision.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that the bicycle path between Silver Plume and Georgetown be preserved in any alternative that is selected in the Record of Decision.

### 3. Georgetown/Silver Plume Grade:

Westbound — The grade of Plume Hill (as it is known by locals) in a westbound direction cannot be eliminated by widening the highway to 6 lanes. It is more instructive to note the "precipitating" factors that bring the grade into play in delaying traffic, to wit:

- Slow-moving vehicles (large trucks, RV's, vehicles with automatic transmissions and no power, etc.) in the left lane. If the slow-moving vehicles stay in the right lane (the more dangerous of the two, given rockfall hazards), there is no hang-up, even with very heavy traffic. The total volume of traffic almost certainly is a negligible factor. There is seldom enough truck or other slow-moving traffic to justify the traditional third "slow traffic climbing lane", except perhaps during peak periods. Simply enforcing a 55 mph minimum in the left lane, making the right lane a de facto "slow traffic climbing lane," is one approach to solving this problem and could generate income through fines to cover at least some of the cost of enforcement.

- An accident on the Plume Hill or further west in either direction. The classic slow down and stare "looky-looky" syndrome observable anywhere comes into play and holds up traffic in both directions even when the accident itself need not hold up traffic.

- Snow slides or rock slides, either on the hill or further west.

- A slick surface on the hill itself from snowfall, coupled with any vehicle that can't handle the slickness (trucks are major problems, but even two-wheel drive sports utility vehicles—for example). CDOT may no doubt disagree, but none of the westbound problems described above would be ameliorated by widening the Silver Plume sector of the highway to 6 lanes.

Eastbound — the hold-up almost always originates east of Georgetown, commonly, at the US 40 junction and at the Twin Tunnels, regardless of weather and road conditions. Otherwise, Eastbound delays are attributable to wrecks or construction, etc., nearby or farther east, and the "looky-looky" effect contributes to the problem. Again, widening the Silver Plume section to 6 lanes would have virtually no positive effect.

Thus, the argument would be that either the Plume Hill problems need to be solved or they don't. If they don't need to be solved, the CDOT proposal to spend a lot of money by building what amount to climbing lanes is needless spending. If CDOT believes problems do need to be solved, widening the highway to six lanes appears to be the most expensive approach.

However, if the solution for a climbing and descending lane is the preference of CDOT, a careful design of the additional lanes is required. In keeping with the idea that development of the I-70 Mountain Corridor should be such that it is a very enticing, desirable trip. The entire corridor should be one which would encourage tourism into the mountains. For this specific section of the roadway, it is envisioned that a tiered, collonaded roadway that is covered to protect from rockfall is appropriate. When designing this section, it is believed to be appropriate to concurrently plan safety from rockfall as a collateral benefit to the construction. A concrete cover (ala a snow shed) built of a substantial thickness, placed at an angle to provide a glacia plate such that it would not be easily penetrated by large rocks. In addition, an earthen cover over the concrete would provide further protection from rockfall and perhaps even meteorological damage. See the conceptual drawing below for an idea of a possible solution.

4. Relocation of the Silver Plume Interchange MP 224/225. The relocation of the interchange to either mile marker 224 or 225 is a decision that must be carefully considered. There are dissenting opinions by citizens of the Town, but it is believed that careful planning can resolve those issues. The main concerns include:

Impact to the businesses within the Town. Three businesses that are located at the base of the current interchange (Buckley Store, The Grumpy Dutchman garage, and Grumpy's Roadhouse) will be isolated when the exit ramp is relocated; thus, CDOT planning to make an access route to these businesses is imperative. For example, planning a commercial district along the frontage road (Water Street) could keep traffic flowing to the commercial businesses and limit travel into residential areas along Main Street from the west-side of Town into the central part of Town. This approach, not yet generally accepted in the Town, is but one alternative that must be carefully considered. It is imperative that access to Town Hall, Sopp and Truscott bakery, Silver Plume Antiques and Tea Room, KP Variety, Plume Lighting and the B&B be carefully considered and included into the final plans, without placing undue traffic loads into the residential areas.

Impact to the Colorado Historic Rail Road. Routing traffic through town during operating months is problematic. The major issues resulting from this is one of public safety (especially of children), congestion (parking west of the overpass, especially), and the need to control (i.e. blockade) traffic through the Jack Pine wilderness and into the residential district east of there.

If the interchange is moved, pedestrian and local traffic movement between the north side and south side of Town must still be preserved.

On the other hand, moving the interchange to the West edge of Town has distinct advantages. It is believed that relocation will improve the currently marginally inadequate acceleration/deceleration lanes. Further, space would be made available in the event the Record of Decision results in more lanes through Silver Plume. In addition, the relocated interchange may result in truck drivers slowing for the descent of Georgetown/Silver Plume hill further to the west, thereby reducing the jake brake noise that currently results adjacent to residential areas on the west side of Town.

At an I-70 Coalition meeting held with the citizens of Silver Plume, Mr. Bryan Pinkerton —CDOT engineer, indicated that a relocation decision will be made after extensive discussions with Town officials. Specific actions such as development of frontage roads to channelize traffic, ensure viability of local businesses, and improve safety and access to local facilities are imperatives that must be considered.

Accordingly, the Town of Silver Plume acknowledges the need for interchange improvement and requests that the Town be included in planning for such.

### 5. Town Owned Facilities/Structures

**Background** — The Towns water treatment facility is located on Town property between I-70 and US 6. The facility was initially constructed on that site in 1894. When I-70 was built in the 1960s, CDOT relocated the central water distribution line from the facility into Town by moving it away from the area upon which I-70 was to be built. That line has experienced leaks and is suspected to be currently leaking. The Town has performed repair work on leaks in the disrupted sector, and discovered that CDOT and its contractors failed to use pipe bedding to protect the main distribution pipe. The construction crews simply dumped excavation waste (with its many rocks — both large and small) as backfill. Subsequently, frost heave has damaged the pipe resulting in the Town currently having to produce unusually large amounts of water for its small population.

In addition, a recent study of the Town's wastewater system, conducted by HDR, Inc. an engineering firm located in Ft. Collins, suspected a potential leak in the line laid in the box culvert through which Clear Creek is routed at the East end of Town. It is possible that either constant vibration from the traffic, or geologic shifting of the box culvert may be the cause, if in fact an infiltration/exfiltration exists. Construction of any of the PEIS Preferred Alternatives must explicitly plan for protection of the utility infrastructure of the Town.

**Status** — The Town of Silver Plume is currently engaged in a \$ 2.25M project to relocate the Water Treatment Facility and to install new distribution lines from the plant to every water customer. The Water Treatment Facility is located approximately one mile west of the Town and the main distribution line from the facility into the Town must be so located as to avoid potential damage from I-70 either during construction or in subsequent use. However, insufficient data is in the PEIS to permit Town authorities to plan placement correctly. In addition, if the Creek is rechannelized (highly likely according to Section 3.4 of the PEIS) it may require another relocation of the central water distribution line between the treatment facility and the Town. The preferred alternatives almost certainly WILL impinge on and disrupt that new water system. These issues are not addressed nor were cost projections made in the PEIS.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that no alternative be selected that adversely impacts the Town Water Treatment and/or water distribution system.

#### 6. Access of citizens and emergency equipment to and from Silver Plume.

Because of the steepness of the Georgetown/Silver Plume grade, no access road adjacent to the main roadway exists in either direction. For some time, the bike path has provided the only emergency alternative to I-70. That alternative is available only to official emergency vehicles and even then, it is questionable whether firefighting equipment could be accommodated. Construction of additional lanes for I-70 and the potential loss of the bike path would adversely affect lives of the citizens — with emergency services and normal daily living needs.

- **Emergency Services** — The town's fire-fighting capability is provided by Clear Creek County Fire Protection (nearest station is Georgetown); the ambulance service provided by Clear Creek Ambulance (nearest station in Georgetown) and police services provided by the Clear Creek Sheriff (Georgetown). It is reputed that an ambulance could utilize the bike path in an emergency situation (fire truck access via this path uncertain), it would considerably delay service if a situation where minutes count exists.

- **Daily Living Needs** — The children of Silver Plume attend school in Georgetown Elementary and Clear Creek High School (on Floyd Hill). Groceries, pharmacy and other needs are obtained from other Clear Creek County municipalities or in Jefferson County. Few people travel into Summit County for daily living needs. Construction anywhere along the I-70 segments in Clear Creek will adversely affect daily living needs.

**7. Economic Disruption During Construction** — The Town of Silver Plume has very limited income from sales tax revenue. Any disruption of economic activity in the Town due to access problems, reduced traffic flow or similar events precipitated by the fifteen-year construction period will adversely impact the municipal budget.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that careful planning for any construction activity along the I-70 corridor be coordinated with local authorities to ensure citizen continual access to facilities such as school, grocery shopping, etc. Further, emergency vehicle access to the Town must be provided continuously and access to local business cannot be blocked.

#### d. Social/Economic Concerns:

##### 1. Environmental Justice (EJ) considerations.

**Introduction.** Executive Order 12898 and its progeny require all US federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects (including social and economic effects) of their policies, programs and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. This requirement is known as Environmental Justice (EJ).

EJ applies to the proposed expansion of Interstate 70 west of Denver. The PEIS purports to examine the issue EJ and concludes that it is not implicated in the proposed expansion. This section challenges that conclusion as applied to Silver Plume. And while the focus is on Silver Plume, most of the arguments apply with nearly equal force to the whole of Clear Creek County west of Floyd Hill, where virtually all the proposed highway widening will occur.

**Summary of Argument.** Silver Plume has the highest incidence of poverty in the entire project corridor. Highway widening is associated with a variety of adverse impacts of the sort required to be included in EJ analysis. Virtually all of those adverse impacts will be in Clear Creek County, and they will be at their worst in Silver Plume.

Meanwhile, those who stand to benefit from the project are far better off economically than those who will pay the greatest price for the project. The PEIS fails to address this project-wide disproportionate impact. It also fails to address such disproportionate impact at the local level, where both negative impacts and incidence of poverty are often a function of distance from the highway.

Finally, postponing proper EJ analysis until Tier 2 will be too late because the transit alternatives most likely to address the problem will already have been eliminated. EJ analysis in the PEIS is fatally flawed and must be redone now, taking into account the true costs of highway widening and applying the proper approach, before proceeding to Tier 2.

Silver Plume has the highest incidence of poverty in the entire corridor. CDOT divided the entire corridor into five counties and 25 sub-county localities for analysis. Population, poverty, and other demographic data for each county and locality are shown in Table 3.11-7 (on page 3.11-6) of the PEIS. The data are based on 2000 Census figures.

The line for Silver Plume shows that 27% of its households are low-income. This means that 27% of the households in Silver Plume made less than half of the median household income for Clear Creek County as a whole. The county median was \$50,997, half of which was \$25,498.50. The Silver Plume median of \$35,208 was questionable then and is even more so now.

In 2004, the Town Board conducted a survey of all households in Silver Plume in order to qualify for better financing terms on a new water system to be partially funded by the Colorado Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) and Federal Department of Agriculture (FDA). FDA uses the same CDBG-based definition of poverty as was used by CDOT in the PEIS. For purposes of the survey, DOLA estimated that the county median household income had dropped to \$48,000, half of which is \$24,000. The results of the survey have now been accepted by DOLA and FDA. They reveal that 54% of the households in Silver Plume earned less than \$24,000.

In short, more recent information shows that 54% of the households in Silver Plume are in fact low-income. Even CDOT's own figure of 27%, however, is exceptionally high— and higher than that of any other locality shown in Table 3.11-7.

Highway widening is associated with a variety of adverse impacts of the sort required to be included in Environmental Justice analysis. Especially in a narrow and inhabited mountain valley like ours, substantially increased pavement and traffic can be expected to have many negative impacts, including the following:

- additional air pollution from vehicle emissions;
- additional noise pollution from motors, brakes, horns, etc.;
- loss of sunlight to some adjacent homes and businesses;
- visual blight (especially if sound barriers are used);
- impairment of historic structures and districts (which are particularly numerous and vulnerable in Silver Plume and Clear Creek County);
- chemical runoff into yards and streams;
- additional exposure to falling rock;
- additional barriers to wildlife movement;
- loss of access during construction (critical to Silver Plume residents, whose only eastbound access is I-70
- loss of the pedestrian/bicycle trail from Silver Plume to Georgetown;
- displacement of homes and business for additional right-of-way.

The PEIS attempts to downplay most of these potential adverse effects, but numerous submissions by other concerned citizens and corridor governments—as well as other sections in this submittal—provide substantial detail on and support for the view that many of them are quite significant in this project.

Virtually all of the adverse effects of the proposed highway widening will be in Clear Creek County. There are at least two reasons for this. First, 90% of the proposed highway widening in the entire corridor is to occur in Clear Creek County between its western boundary at the Eisenhower tunnels and Floyd Hill on the east. East of Floyd Hill the highway is already six lanes wide. (Significantly, the portion

of the county from Floyd Hill east—the portion that will not be affected by highway widening—is also the area with the highest income in the County—the household median is \$70,300 according to CDOT's own Table 3.11-7. Factor out Floyd Hill and Clear Creek surely becomes the poorest county in the corridor.)

Second, Clear Creek has more existing development up against the existing highway than do other parts of the corridor. The impacts of highway-generated air pollution, noise pollution, loss of sunlight, visual blight, impairment of historic structures and districts, and other adverse effects of widening the highway and significantly increasing the amount of traffic on it are all exacerbated by proximity to the offending highway. Generally speaking, the closer you are to the highway, the worse the adverse effects are. And the highway between Floyd Hill and Eisenhower is situated in a particularly narrow valley with a substantial percentage of the population located close to the highway.

Despite extensive review of census statistics, consultation with the State Demography Office, and other efforts, we have not been able to locate any data relating the incidence of poverty to distance from the highway. Nor does the PEIS contain such data (though it should). But a windshield survey clearly reveals that much of the poorest housing in the County and Silver Plume—presumably containing some of the poorest households—is located nearest the highway. As is so often the case, the poor suffer most.

These adverse impacts are at their worst in Silver Plume, where the sounds of braking trucks are at their loudest, the loss of access during construction is greatest, the valley is at its narrowest, and the poorest dwellings are closest to the highway. Though the PEIS says the highway will be widened without any displacement of residents, it is hard to believe that this is possible in Silver Plume. Here's why:

Houses along the south side of Water and Madison Streets back right up to the north edge of the highway right-of-way already. Cliffs and the station facilities of the state-owned Georgetown Loop Railway preclude expansion along the south of the existing highway. Addition of two or more lanes along the north, whether they are supported by retaining walls as suggested on Page L-30 of the PEIS (Vol. 2) or cantilevered as informally stated by CDOT, will hover over those houses like the sword of Damocles. They will block sunlight, spread pollutants, and create a din far worse than at present. Even if a house remains literally unshaken, it will become virtually uninhabitable. Under Colorado law, CRS 38-1-114(c), where only part of a parcel is taken through eminent domain, the condemning authority must also pay for any damages to the remainder of the parcel. Owners of the uninhabitable houses may well insist that the state take—and compensate them for—the entire parcel. And the state may welcome the invitation to do just that. After all, cantilevering or retaining walls could well cost more than just acquiring and destroying the entire row of houses—and displacing the predominantly low-income people that occupy them.

Given the shortage of affordable housing that already exists in Clear Creek County, loss of their present homes may be irredeemable for those low-income people, however much cash compensation they are given. For those who have long made their lives in Silver Plume, the displacement will be particularly wrenching.

Beneficiaries of the project are far better off economically than those who will pay the greatest price for the project. Two classes of people will benefit from the project, which is proposed primarily to relieve peak recreation traffic on weekends. The first class contains the owners and operators of ski areas and other recreational businesses on the west slope, mostly in Summit and Eagle counties. The PEIS contains no demographic data on this group of beneficiaries (though it should), and we are aware of none. But surely this is a group with average wealth and income far in excess of Clear Creek County in general and Silver Plume in particular.

The second class consists of travelers on the improved transportation corridor. At non-peak travel times, they might be expected to have fairly average demographics, but it is not such times that the project aims at. The project is aimed at facilitating the flow of recreational traffic from and back to the Denver Metro Area on weekends—especially during ski season in the winter. Given the cost of skiing or many of the other forms of recreation involved, this group of travelers can also be expected to have above average income.

The PEIS fails to address Environmental Justice adequately at either the local level or the project-wide level. CDOT's approach to the EJ issue is to view the corridor as a string of different localities. Each of those localities may incur adverse impacts which differ in kind or degree from other localities, but within any particular locality—Silver Plume, for example—the impacts are essentially uniform within the community. Thus the adverse impacts on low-income populations within Silver Plume are the same as they are on non-low-income populations in Silver Plume. The PEIS asserts that there is no disproportionate impact, therefore no EJ problem.

There are two problems with this approach. First, it is inadequate even on its own terms. As argued earlier, negative impacts and the incidence of poverty are often a function of distance from the highway. Based on personal knowledge, we believe it highly likely that there is a larger proportion of low-income households near the highway in Silver Plume (and indeed throughout most of Clear Creek County) the further away from the highway. We lack the hard data to test this assertion, but a proper analysis by CDOT would have included such data. In short, the PEIS should have included and analyzed data on both impacts and poverty as a function of distance from the highway within each of the relevant localities.

Second, focusing exclusively on EJ at the local level ignores the big picture. Viewed as a whole, the project clearly displays a clustering of adverse impacts in the poorest county (Clear Creek) and especially the poorest locality (Silver Plume) in the entire corridor—all for the benefit of significantly better off populations elsewhere within or even outside the corridor. Surely this is precisely the kind of disproportionate impact that EJ analysis is designed to address.

Postponing proper EJ analysis until Tier 2 will be too late because the alternative most likely to address the problem will already have been eliminated. Concerned Silver Plume officials have made numerous attempts, going back many months, to raise their EJ concerns with CDOT. On November 10, 2004, for example, Cassandra Sherk, a Town Trustee, wrote to Cecilia Joy, the CDOT Project Manager, requesting a meeting on the subject. Her response was that any such meeting should await completion of the draft PEIS. Renewed efforts since the draft PEIS was completed have been equally unavailing.

CDOT now asserts that all our concerns can be adequately mitigated in Tier 2. We strongly disagree. Proper EJ analysis is supposed to occur as early as possible in the process of scoping a project and narrowing the alternatives. If CDOT is unwilling or unable to do it right in Tier 1 (the PEIS), the chances of them doing it right later on are slight.

More importantly, what are probably the most attractive alternatives to highway widening—rail and, especially, advanced guideway systems (AGS), are on the verge of being eliminated from further consideration. Companion papers and other sections of this submittal argue the multiple advantages of AGS over any of the highway alternatives which CDOT currently favors. Suffice it to say here that virtually all of the disproportionately high and adverse effects referenced above go away with an AGS approach. But by Tier 2, AGS will no longer be on the table.

This project is a textbook study of how performing or dodging a proper EJ analysis can directly affect the choices made at the Tier 1 stage of analysis. It is unfortunate (especially for those of us who are Colorado taxpayers) that CDOT has spent so much time and money on such an inadequate PEIS. But they have, and there is no legal or moral choice now but to go back and do it right before proceeding to the next step.

## 2. Economic Disruption In Colorado

The citizens of the Front Range and central Colorado must ask themselves to consider how they envision their lives until 2025. Those citizens live here to enjoy the mountains — the vistas, the openness, the recreation, but today the enjoyment is difficult because of siting in traffic. During the cited fifteen-year construction period with periodic lane shifting and complete closures, the citizens will be deprived of the very reasons they chose to live in the area. With alternative travel (transit), they will be able to reach the mountain region for recreation, business and second-homes.

**Business Impact** — A key factor in economic disruption will be the impact to the owners of small businesses. They have to anticipate fewer customers because of limited travel. Their survival may be at stake — large businesses that depend upon pavement (trucking industry, freight companies) may be financially able to weather a protracted construction period. The small businesses that depend upon drop-in customers (restaurants, shops, gasoline stations) will struggle during periods of construction. Large businesses (ski corporations, national firms such as UPS, FedEx, statewide firms such as Safeway, City Market) will struggle through the construction. Those firms who have an option (interstate trucking for example) will select alternatives such as I-80 to avoid the construction. These factors will definitely affect municipal tax collections as well as statewide sales tax collections.

**Recreational Impact** — Both the in-state and out-of-state travelers won't want to be dodging the "cone zone" for fifteen years. This construction impact will affect both

- In-state travelers — suppressed demand for travel — why fight the cone-zone?

- Out-of-state travelers One trip through the cone-zone results in reschedule recreation traffic to another state where that is not a factor. After fifteen years, travelers re-evaluate where recreation will occur.

Regrettably, after this phase of construction is completed (now to 2025), travelers will still be sitting in traffic as dense as the present volume according to PEIS estimates of travel time.

Post 2025 travel — Colorado citizens begin the next round of discussions regarding the widening of highways once again. If a short range view (more paving) is selected, those sections not widened by the current PEIS will be congestion points and require widening too. A long-range view (say to 2050) for transporting people without relying on pavement is required. A transit solution must be one of the preferred alternatives. If in the future more people need be accommodated for travel, a transit system need only to add cars or increase the frequency of the runs but more pavement will not be required. The Denver area metro area citizens 2004 vote to pass the FasTracks initiative is a convincing show of acceptance, indeed more of an urging toward a more modern transportation method in the area.

3. Property Values —The Town of Silver Plume is concerned with the impact of highway widening on the value of our citizen's property. The property value impact results from two factors:

- Because citizens feel they might have to move if highway construction proves as awful as it seems (fifteen years of access problems, noise, etc.) or
- Because if the selected I-70 option results in widening, increased footprint/noise/etc. make the desirability of homes adjacent to it unattractive.

In August 2004 at a meeting in Silver Plume, a CDOT representative expressed an opinion, that it could just as well be argued that the improved highway would increase property values. However, that misses the point. Property values and their effect on life need to be measured in the short, foreseeable run — the 15 or more years of construction envisioned for any of the Preferred Alternatives — as well as for the long run.

It is intuitively certain that any of the Preferred Alternatives will reduce the property value of houses and businesses in Silver Plume during the construction period and conceivably for some years afterward. Our existing values depend heavily on both our "quiet" historic character and setting, and on our small-town, casual intimacy as a place to live and as a place to raise children. The intrusion of massive highway construction and bottled up traffic inevitable in any of the preferred alternatives will obviously change the town substantially, introducing a significantly more urban, barren and congested look and feel for at least the 15 year projected construction period.

This might be classified as a "provisional taking" with potentially profound near term consequences that have not been accounted for by CDOT and the PEIS.

#### 4. Increased Crime

The Town of Silver Plume currently enjoys a relatively crime-free environment. Widening the highway to 6 lanes and increasing substantially the number of cars on the road must increase the number of accidents in our vicinity and the incidence of "drop-in" off the highway crime. There is no discussion or analysis of these impacts in the PEIS.

#### 5. Quality of Life

Two things are clear in connection with questions concerning the impact widening I-70 would have on the quality of life of the people of Silver Plume:

- The first is that except for noting the significant increase in adverse noise and alluding to geophysical impacts that might or might not be addressed in Tier 2, CDOT essentially has ignored quality of life impacts.

• The second is that widening I-70 would have as yet unstated, fundamentally negative impacts on our lives and — we submit — on the lives of people everywhere in this country. Every instance in which any level of government anywhere in the nation rides roughshod over the lives of its people, stands as a dangerous precedent. For several decades there has been a cumulative movement toward the supremacy of the political governance over the privacy and independence of individuals. To widen I-70 through the center of Silver Plume, contrary to and without regard for the expressed wishes of the Town's people would mean that the State of Colorado demeans the view of those people. If there were no other alternatives that would address the transportation issues in the corridor, such an authoritarian condemnation would probably be acceptable.

The response of Silver Plume's people would probably be "Oh well, we're outnumbered and outgunned. That's life in the 21st-century. Governments condemn people's homes all the time, and even though there are supposed to be some financial reparations for the takings, no government anywhere has ever worried about people's lives; all they react to is some sort of 'market value' for the physical property. (As it happens, we've noticed recently that the Colorado government seems to think it only needs to pay off about HALF the market value.)"

HOWEVER, there ARE other transportation alternatives, in the form of transit, that have been dropped from consideration because CDOT has placed an upper limit on the dollars to be spent on I-70 transportation, and because CDOT sees a way to increase highway revenues on a sustained basis by charging tolls for the lanes involved in widening the highway.

The impact of widening I-70 on the basis of such ugly considerations would be to leave the people of Silver Plume bitter, angry, and more or less hateful and distrusting toward government generally. Although such an impact can't be readily quantified in the splendidly indifferent way CDOT pretends to quantify its PEIS conclusions, anyone with any sense of history and human psychology will recognize that that impact is profound and insidious.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that the PEIS be amended in Section 3-11. The study must recognize Silver Plume as a low-income population and a determination of the direct and indirect impacts to low-income population be addressed.

#### e. Section 106 Historic Properties and Section 4(f) Recreation Impact

Silver Plume is a part of the Georgetown-Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District. Designation of this District carries a requirement to exercise extra care for projects as I-70 widening. Because of this designation, CDOT must "avoid and minimize harm" to the district and this involve providing protection such as:

Ensuring no physical impact — such as disturbance of the properties (construction damage either through direct or through long-term damage from vibration, etc.), removal for ROW, etc.

Ensuring no noise impact — Extending the 66 db noise contour into over one-half of the town is absolutely unacceptable.

Ensuring no visual impact — requires design of new I-70 structures to be a context-sensitive design.

Ensuring no cumulative impact — the initial placement of I-70 through the middle of town, removing homes, separating the community into two distinct portions, and changing the environment of the community were impacts that resulted from that effort. This expansion of I-70 cannot be allowed to further impact the community. It would appear from the PEIS, that widening of the roadway, significantly increasing the noise boundary, placement of multiple lanes at grade, etc. is a distinct violation of the "cumulative impact" aspect.

Ensuring no construction impact — The construction activities may include blasting, construction equipment noise, disruption of the small economic activity (and resultant sales tax revenues) of the Town, and preclusion of the Town's citizens from being able to reach grocery, pharmacy, schools and similar daily living activities will be impacted by the road closure of construction.

A final consideration is the fact that the Town has a large flood-plain as described by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Extreme care must be taken when engineering crossings of Clear Creek under any selected I-70 alternative. For example, even the construction of a simple box culvert must be carefully designed so that it will accommodate the 500-year flood flow preventing debris blockage of the culvert which might cause flooding of the Town's historical buildings.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that complete review of Section 106 concerns (physical, noise, visual, cumulative and construction) be conducted prior to selection of the preferred alternative for the Record of Decision.

With respect of Section 4(f) Recreation Impacts, Silver Plume depends upon Clear Creek as a major recreation source for fishing. It is believed that wide-scale widening of the Creek will result in a severe degradation of the fishing as described in 2.b.4 of this paper. Damages to the creek are not acceptable as part of the I-70 expansion process.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that complete review of Section 4(f) concerns be conducted prior to selection of the preferred alternative for the Record of Decision. The Town believes that expansion of I-70 is a violation of the statutes with regard to public recreation facilities.

#### f. Emergency Services Impact to Silver Plume

The current Interstate highway places a huge burden on local emergency services for all Corridor Communities. As traffic volume increases, so too do incident rates. Therefore, Silver Plume believes that safety and the reduction of accident, injury and fatality rates must be a priority for the selection of any alternative. This imperative is not primarily the result of costs borne by the Town, but also because it is a factor for our citizens who depend upon I-70 to serve daily living needs (shopping, school, medical). Traffic incidents not only injure our residents and visitors, but significantly congest the highway.

Decreasing the number of incidents may have a greater impact on congestion and delays than would selection of any single proposed alternative.

Silver Plume's municipal budget is very limited due to the minimal properties creating the tax base, and the very small business base that generates sales tax revenues. Yet, in spite of its small revenue stream, the community contributes a significant amount of its budget toward maintaining the emergency services capabilities of the county. These costs increase for emergency services are placing an increasing financial burden on the Town's tax-payers. The increased density of traffic will serve only to increase the financial burden, with no corresponding increase in sales or property taxes.

A further impact of I-70 on the community is the human burden. Our citizens are members of the volunteer fire-fighting force; local citizens who volunteer to do fire-fighting to protect local properties. Because requirements of the past few years have been increasingly to respond to I-70 incidents, the local citizen volunteers are becoming disillusioned and leaving the force because they do not feel as dedicated to responding to non-local needs. The I-70 incidents seldom involve local residents; those

people who the volunteers wish to serve. The net result is that our force of volunteers for fire-fighting in our community is dwindling because of I-70. Yet, the PEIS is striving to increase traffic flows, thus further dwindling the force.

Silver Plume respectfully requests an analysis of the emergency services costs related to each of proposed alternatives, specific to the projected incident rates of the alternative. Further, it is requested that the emergency service costs be factored into the overall cost estimates.

### 3. Comments on Specific Alternatives Addressed in PEIS

#### a. Highway Alternatives:

The federal interstate highway system was built partially as a Department of Defense initiative to improve movement across the United States. In Colorado, there exists only two east to west lanes — I-70 and US-50. Those two routes were sufficient when Colorado population was small, but today only two major routes are not desirable. Strategic planning for movement across the State in the event of a Homeland Security or natural disaster is severely limited. Development of alternate routes is an imperative! To do so would relieve pressure on the I-70 corridor. The elimination of alternate routes early in the screening process is considered premature given the homeland defense needs. As a minimum, alternates from the major population hub (Denver — Central Front Range) to allow dispersal into the mountains must be considered. Further, interstate movement of goods and services must be planned for routes other than I-70 only. The construction of tunnels, at locations other than existing (EJMT for example) would provide redundancy for interstate movement, probably cost no more than additional bores at already known locations, and take pressure off the I-70 corridor.

It is imperative that no expansion of Right-Of-Way impact Silver Plume. Residential properties are adjacent to the highway and to remove homes is unacceptable. In addition, a huge retaining wall at the residential property boundary line casting a permanent shadow over the homes is equally unacceptable.

#### b. Combination Alternatives

##### Bus in Guideway

There is no discussion of snow removal in connection with the Bus in Guideway alternative. Generally the guideway(s) are in the median and flanked by Jersey Barriers (or other barriers), which would preclude the standard CDOT snow plow methods. These trucks spread magnesium chloride and spew the snow to the side. The barriers would probably require the use of some sort of bucket loader to remove snow from the guideway. Then presumably, the snow would have to be plowed away by the standard methods. There is no discussion of the cost-effectiveness and increased maintenance costs associated with this problem. Moreover, the electric power rail for Dual Mode buses and the guidance wheels for the non-dual mode buses would probably be adversely affected by winter snow and snow removal methods. No discussion of this problem exists in the PEIS.

Also, on page L-30, there is no mention of retaining walls on Georgetown Hill for the Guideway alternatives. Physical inspection of the roadway suggest that the retaining walls will be required for the Guideway, thus adding to the existing footprint. (See the discussion above in context with impacts on the existing bike path.) This is especially critical at the three narrow places in Clear Creek canyon.

#### c. Transit Alternatives:

A transit option provides a much greater capacity over time. As suggested in the PEIS, the widening and pavement options reach capacity shortly after completion. With transit, specifically an elevated rail system, permits additional capacity for a very long term (say fifty years or more). Further, such a system offers capabilities in severe weather. For example, reaching metropolitan hospitals would be possible even when weather precludes highway movement. Metro Denver residents could easily make day trips into the mountain communities without highway congestion and this will help stimulate the economies of the mountain areas. While it may not be economically feasible to develop a transit stop in the Town of Silver Plume because of the small population, a s minimum a stop must be planned for Georgetown to make it feasible for citizens to utilize it.

### 4. Conclusion

Several factors are included for consideration by CDOT. These items are critical for deciding the selected alternative.

#### a. Mitigation

Mitigation of all adverse affects associated with expansion of I-70 through Silver Plume must be carefully planned. It is recognized that some compromise is necessary for example, to impede noise levels one will have to sacrifice viewsheds from I-70 Working with the local jurisdictions should make decisions of this type easier for CDOT. In the case described, the citizens would prefer noise abatement over protection of the viewshed from I-70. In all mitigation activities, a context sensitive design, rather than standard design, must be followed as indicated in Section 3.19 of the PEIS.

Paragraph 3.19.1, fourth bullet indicates "Detailed planning in restrictive locations" including Silver Plume has been done. Regrettably, the detail plans that have been completed have not been shared with the Town government or citizens.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that the municipality be included in planning of mitigation measures for I-70 through the Town.

#### b. Transportation Planning — Local Jurisdiction Involvement

Transportation planning can be a crucial tool for managing growth and development in the I-70 Regional Planning Organizations, such as DRCOG who included transportation planning in their Metro Vision Plan, work to keep transportation planning in sync with growth objectives. Because the I-70 corridor crosses boundaries of regional planning organizations, a comprehensive planning document synchronized with growth objectives does not exist. However, the Town of Silver Plume does agree that the PEIS document should not serve as a growth depressant or stimulant. But, the Town of Silver Plume strongly believes that local jurisdiction input should be included in the planning.

The drawing in Section 2.b.3, Noise, suggests a type of context sensitive, minimally invasive environmentally approach to putting increased traffic flow through the Town of Silver Plume.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that the municipality be included in I-70 planning through the Town and including the Georgetown/Silver Plume path.

#### c. Silver Plume A fragile ecosystem in the I-70 Path

Given the criticality of Silver Plume's fragile position (in terms of the lives of our ordinary citizens and economically and historically) the Town challenges the structure and legitimacy of the cost-benefit analysis implicit in the PEIS. If the analysis can't answer these questions, it is defective and possibly fatally flawed. Perhaps, it might actually turn out that leaving Silver Plume out of the project would be no big deal for the overall corridor, given the nature and location of Plume Hill.

The Town of Silver Plume is adversely impacted on the basis of environmental justice. In addition to the detailed explanation in paragraph 2.d.1, it should be noted that according to the 2000 census data (which our Town believes is very much overstated), 50% of related children under the age of 18, are determined to be in poverty status within Silver Plume. (Source U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File

3, Matrices P53, P77, P82, P87, P90, PCT47, and PCT52.

However, more importantly is the fact that Silver Plume truly is one of the last populated mining sites exhibiting true architectural examples of late 1800s towns in the State. No action should be taken to disrupt the character of our National Historic Landmark District mining town. Section 106 is a protection that must be followed.

The Town of Silver Plume requests that the issue of Environmental Justice be thoroughly investigated and that appropriate measures be taken to ensure the fragile Silver Plume ecosystem be preserved.

#### d. Rail FasTracks and the Future Vision:

The citizens of the metro Denver area spoke with a clear voice in the elections of November 2004. At that time, they voted to implement FasTracks, a rail system that will permit rail travel throughout the metropolitan area. The citizens were willing to accept a tax increase to implement a system that will permit the use of a modern transit option. The Town of Silver Plume believes that election to be an expression of the will of the constituency served by CDOT, to implement a similar transit option for use into the recreational areas currently served by I-70 highway.

A transit system should be able to provide throughput of people, sports equipment, and freight. Haulage of recreational items too large for ordinary transit to handle efficiently (boats for example) is relatively infrequent — to the point that it does not merit consideration.

A transit system does not require more paving and taking of property for a larger footprint for roadway and shoulders. A modern transit system will provide predictable, safe and fast travel from the metropolitan area via a connection from FasTracks to a mountain transit system. Metro citizens would be able to enjoy daily recreation, commuter travel for business, or travel to a second home in the mountains.

#### d. Support of I-70 Coalition Proposed Alternative

The Town of Silver Plume supports the proposed alternative adopted by the I-70 Coalition. The

Categorized Comment	31	MacDonald, Ian	Public	1/11/2005	Buses to ski areas  It will take many years to add more badly needed lanes to I-70. By then there will be even more of us trying to drive them. How about some immediate relief by offering bus service to the ski areas? Presently there is the train to Winter Park, which is great, but pricy. I would be thrilled to relax on a bus instead of enduring the stressful drive every time I go skiing. If there is presently bus service offered I haven't been able to find it, but would like to be advised of it.  Ian MacDonald idthinair@directway.com	Online
Categorized Comment	132	Macey, Bill	Municipalities	1/12/2005	From Bill Macey, city council of Idaho Springs. Dennis Lunbery was going to comment tonight but got called away by an emergency and will no doubt comment later.  The one comment that we had from the city tonight is that the documents are very massive, and we have a limited staff and request an extension of at least 90 days to the comment period.  Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	427	Mackie, Diana	Public	4/4/2005	Loveland Ski Area would be very adversely affected by the third bore tunnel, taking out Lift 4 and eliminating The Face piste. It is important to learn if there could be additional development of other parts of the terrain to balance off the new tunnel. Or could the tunnel be buried in its approach.	Online
Categorized Comment	823	Madsen, Peggy	Public	5/24/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  6-lane highway + build mass transit (cost to be determined)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  Do the maximum a.s.a.p. because the population is going to swell with all the immigration. We need transportation for our safety - can't have any bottlenecks, and the whole highway is a bottleneck.	Written
Categorized Comment	758	Maguire, Patti	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  Patti Maguire, P O Bxo 1804, Dillon, CO 80435	Written
Categorized Comment	254	Malkan, Doug	Public	3/2/2005	After attending the CDOT public meeting in Silverthorn on Feb. 23 and seeing the charts and asking questions I am even more in favor of the dual-mode bus system. The advantage of this alternative is that it provides a solution well past the year 2025 when the construction would likely just be completed. With 6 lanes only as an alternative the highway is in practically the same condition as it is today and would then proceed to get worse as it is doing now. This would not be a satisfactory solution after spending billions of dollars and putting up with 15 years of construction and the associated economic hardship. But the inclusion of the dual-mode bus lane adds less than \$1B to the cost of the project and the project still comes in at the \$4B budget target. The advantage of adding the bus lane would be the considerable extension of the year the solution is good until for a minimal additional cost. Also it would provide the element of mass transit, that while not as good as the advanced guideway, would nevertheless produce many of the same positive benefits. It is clear that the only way to solve the I-70 problem is to include some form of mass transit and I believe the dual-mode bus option is the best alternative at the \$4B price range.  thank you, doug malkan 362 shekel lane breckenridge, co 80424	Online
Categorized Comment	255	Malkan, Doug	Public	3/2/2005	To clarify - the cost I discussed above for the dual-mode bus system included 6 lanes, ie. the combined 6 lanes and dual-mode bus. It is apparent to me that the project is heading in the direction of the 6 lane alternative. My comment is meant to support the addition of the dual-mode bus lane with the 6 lanes since the cost of including the bus lane would be well less than \$1B when in the combined project.  thank you.	Online
Categorized Comment	100	Malkan, Doug	Public	2/1/2005	My comment is in favor of mass transit. I am in favor of the Advanced Guideway System. It is a long term, future oriented option. Right now, and in the future even with another lane, traffic is backed up, slow, and subject to weather conditions that can be very dangerous. The AGS would give people an alternative to being in a car on a high mountain pass in sometimes blizzard or icy conditions. The AGS would be much faster and safer for travelers and relieve traffic for those who still drive their cars.  If you will not fund or build the above correct solution, as my second choice please install the two way bus lane. This would give us mass transit that would come close to the benefits of the AGS. It would take drivers off the road that don't have the skill or luck to survive a crossing during bad weather. It would improve speed of travel during traffic jams and high volume days. It would be a valuable form of mass transit and even combined with the 6 lane alternative come in under the \$4B budget.  thank you, doug malkan	Online
Categorized Comment	375	Malkan, Doug	Public	2/23/2005	Hi. This is good. My name is Doug Malkan. I've lived in Summit County for 15 years. I've driven the corridor many times in bad weather.  I want to plead with you to please have a mass transit as part of the alternative or the alternative for the highway. Your own projection shows that just widening the highway alone with a baseline of 2025 will not be sufficient when that year comes. And besides the fact that adding the transit component is the only way to extend the solution beyond the time that we complete the project in 2025.  The highway is -- I consider it dangerous many times of the year in the winter. I don't think everybody that on that highway has the skill to drive in blizzard conditions or has a vehicle that can handle it. If there's a mass transit solution, those people can ride in comfort and probably more speed up and down the hill. I'm just asking you to please include a transit.  As far as the transit, I know that the guideway, which, of course, would be my preferred alternative, is probably too expensive. If we can afford it, that's what we should do, though. But if we have to stick with a \$4 billion project, I like the dual-bus mode. I think it includes an element of alternative energy -- that it can run on electric power. Maybe we'll have more wind power by 2025. And it also seems very flexible how buses can drive right off the street and then right into the guideway and then right off. I think it's a great compromise if we can't have the guideway.  And, of course, I like rail, of course, too. But please include one of the three components in the solution, either from the guideway to the dual-bus mode.  Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	208	Mann, Hans	Public	1/12/2005	Do the AGS-system first, it has a small footprint! It will take a lot of cars off the road and is not sensitive to bad weather and snow! It also does not have to slow down, at bad weather! It is also very save! More road lanes, more constant roadwork, more pollution, more highway equipment! VERY BAD idea!	Form

Categorized Comment	630	Maragon, Lisa	Public	5/18/2005	455 Steele Street Denver, CO 80206  May 18, 2005  Cecelia Joy Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011  Dear Colorado Department of Transportation,  In regards to your I-70 mountain highway expansion, I oppose widening of that corridor. More traffic and lanes means more damage to water quality and wildlife habitat. Added noise will be intolerable for residents. Noise reduction walls will prevent tourists from enjoying the beautiful scenery. Please include full environmental costs in your analysis, not capital cost only.  I support strongly a Fixed Guideway Transit System using rail technology as your preferred alternative.  Sincerely,  Lisa Maragon	Written
Categorized Comment	200	Mardis, Ann	Public	2/18/2005	Has anyone considered building an additional highway to the south of the current I-70? The road could go from Limon to Grand Junction. It should buy some time for the Mountain corridor. The transcontinental traffic would avoid the mt. passes, although adding a few miles the gas saving to truckers would be substantial with no elevation change, and time savings in the winter months.  This type road could increase commerce to Colorado Springs, Buena Vista, Salida and other areas. It is another road which could open other areas of Colorado and potentially take a lot of traffic off of I-70. The Front Range traffic might find other areas to travel. With new roads other opportunities might become available to many people and new traffic patterns could emerge. This new road could present a lot of new opportunity, fewer mountain passes, less elevation change, higher speed limit throughout and currently less population in the area/less traffic.  Has any study ever been done? Has anyone ever considered this alternative? Please let me know. I'm curious as to what you think.  Sincerely, Ann Mardis	Online
Categorized Comment	301	Marle, Greg	Public	2/9/2005	My name's Greg Marle, county surveyor and also with KGOAT radio. And I brought some masking tape in case my cell phone here falls apart.  I'll be the first to admit, I didn't read the PEIS. It took me all summer just to read The Da Vinci Code, and that's supposed to be a fast read. I know there's some people out there like Jo Ann Sorensen and the commissioners, and these hard working people who have devoted huge amounts of time to studying this thing and picking it apart, and basically protecting us and looking out after us. I'd like to give a round of applause. Cindy Neely, thanks a lot.  I'd like for CDOT to come clean and just tell us what we need to know, and that is: How are our lives going to be affected by all this? You know, are we going to be able to get to work and get our kids to school? What about if we have to drive to Denver? I mean, how is all of this really going to affect us? This is really what we want to know. I'm calling on CDOT to paint a very clear picture to tell us what life is going to be like in the next 15 years. I mean, if we need to sell our houses and get the heck out of here, just tell us, but we need to know. And that's very important to me.  I just want to mention that KGOAT radio will be providing a forum every Saturday morning from 9:00 to 10:00 until this comment period is over. I will be going over specifics of this PEIS. And you're all invited to make comments on both sides.  So, anyway, thanks very much.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	726	Marsh, Harry	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  Front range folk need access to mountains. So do people flying in. Fuel prices are spiking. Population is growing. Pollution is threatening. Bite the bullet and do what's right.	Written
Categorized Comment	477	Marsh, Simon	Public	5/8/2005	Widening the highway would be detrimental to the quality of life in the mountains, including increased pollution, a loss of mountain communities that the highway would pave its way through, to name a few.  A fixed guideway transit system is the long-term best alternative. Yes, costs are higher, but so was building a new airport, and three new sports stadiums in the past ten years, which didn't seem to hinder people's acceptance to dig deeper into their pockets.  To have a system such as a monorail, its long-term benefits are consistent with creating a minimum impact upon the environment, is safer during bad weather, among other advantages.  The long term cost is actually cheaper to have a monorail, will save the mountain communities, and will have a much smaller impact upon the environment, the lowest of all the options.	Online
Categorized Comment	436	Martinez, Andrew	Public	4/11/2005	We should be looking for long term solutions to the traffic problem in the I70 west corridor. The solution, in my opinion, is to construct a light rail to the ski areas, facilitated by spokes to the specific area. This would provide the best and safest mode of transportation to the ski areas, and would most likely increase the number of persons using the ski facilities. It would also be the best solution from an environmental point of view. From a long term cost consideration, this would probably end up less costly for the taxpayer.  Andrew Martinez Jr.	Online
Categorized Comment	258	Martinez, Timothy	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/2/2005	I'm Tim Martinez, I'm the president of the Floyd Hill Property Owners Association.  We will all, as residents, be impacted very significantly by the Colorado Department of Transportation's decision to make improvements to the I-70 corridor. The association would like to make comments regarding the I-70 mountain corridor draft PEIS.  This study was supposed to be based on a 50-year vision, but the sole focus of this study appears to be the alternatives' ability to meet travel demand in the year 2025. The association is concerned that the document does not address the needs of the state prior to and beyond the year 2025.  The association would request that the Colorado Department of Transportation expand the scope of this PEIS to include a 50-year solution.  The association would like CDOT to consider solutions that include mobility in the corridor; the ability for residents and travelers to access local establishments such as schools, shopping, work, and emergency facilities as well as construction funding availability for the entire 50-year period. This document does not appear to address the needs of the local residents in this regard.  Suggesting that these needs would be addressed during Tier II is not acceptable. A 15-year construction period for the preferred alternatives is unprecedented in recent history.  The impact of this construction to the association and Clear Creek County residents may prove disastrous. There are numerous impacts that are a direct result of the 15-year construction period that are not even addressed in this document. These include the economic impact of devalued properties throughout the county, loss of tax revenue due to loss of business, loss of tourism due to off-peak closures and delays, additional traffic from construction vehicles and delayed tourists, and safety issues brought on by the lack of alternative routes during construction. The association would like CDOT to address the impacts on each of these issues for the full construction period.  T-Rex is a commendable effort, but the I-70 mountain corridor is different. The mountain corridor has no alternate routes such as Santa Fe Drive. T-Rex did not have a 15-year construction period. The association would like CDOT to provide either an alternative highway route or transit option before impacting the I-70 corridor with construction.  This document does not provide state or local residents with alternate means of transportation through or around the I-70 corridor so that the construction period could proceed with minimal disruption. Alternate routes that could have provided an east to west travel option to I-70 were dismissed at the	Transcripts



outset because of the social and economic impacts. Alternate local routes are all but existent in the area. Alternate modes of transit, such as monorail or the advanced guideway system adjacent to or further away from the current highway should be considered so that construction does not impact the current highway operation.

The association is concerned that all the CDOT preferred alternatives are less attractive than doing nothing at all for the next 20 years. The no-action alternative would promote additional ski trips more than any other preferred alternative during the period from 2010 to 2025. The economic impact on our community based on the preferred alternatives may be devastating.

Commuters that live on Floyd Hill, including me, who work in the greater Denver metro area, will be inconvenienced with the interchange and construction work in Jefferson County and may choose to relocate to gain acceptable travel times due to off-peak closures and delays.

Recreational travelers will have to plan on delays and extended travel times for the entire construction period. According to this document, these same travelers will not have significantly improved travel times after the construction is complete. The association would like to see the Colorado Department of Transportation provide solutions that are significantly better than the current preferred alternatives.

The Floyd Hill Property Owners Association is completely opposed to tolling for local residents. This study has identified tolling as an alternative funding source and will round out the required funding for the preferred alternatives. With no alternate routes and no alternative mode of transportation, tolling local residents is unacceptable. The association would request that the reporting for the alternative means of funding does not include tolling of local residents.

With all due respect for the people who have put so much effort into this document, the document and the recommended alternatives miss the mark. The Colorado Department of Transportation has given the people of the state of Colorado and the residents of the Floyd Hill area preferred alternatives that will reduce the quality of life for us and to our families for the next 15 to 20 years.

The association requests that Colorado Department of Transportation look at alternatives that include the quality of our lives and the lives of our children, who will have to deal with the decisions long after most of us will be able to drive.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment							
813	Floyd Hill Property Owners Association	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/2/2005	February 2, 2005	<p>TO: Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Whereas the Floyd Hill Area Property Owners Association and the residents of Floyd Hill will be impacted by the Colorado Department of Transportation's decision to make improvements to the I-70 corridor, the Association wishes to make known its concerns with the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS.</p> <p>This study was supposed to be based on a 50-year vision, but the sole focus of the study is the alternatives' ability to meet travel demand in the year 2025. The Association is concerned that this document does not address the needs of the state prior to and beyond the year 2025. The Association would request that the Colorado Department of Transportation expand the scope of this PEIS to include a 50-year solution. The Association would like CDOT to consider solutions that include mobility in the corridor (the ability for residents and travelers to access local establishments, such as schools, shopping, work and emergency facilities) as well as construction funding availability for the entire 50-year period. This document does not appear to address the needs of the local residents in this regard. Suggesting that these needs would be addressed during Tier 2 is not acceptable.</p> <p>A 15-year construction period for the preferred alternatives is unprecedented in recent history. The impact of this construction to the Association and Clear Creek County's residents may prove disastrous. There are numerous impacts that are a direct result of the 15-year construction phase that are not addressed in this document. These include the economic impact of devalued properties throughout the county, loss of tax revenue due to loss of business, loss of tourism due to off-peak closures and delays, additional traffic from construction vehicles and delayed tourists, and safety issues brought about by the lack of alternative routes during construction. The Association would like CDOT to address the impact on each of these issues for the full construction period. T-REX is a commendable effort but the I-70 mountain corridor is different. The mountain corridor has no alternate routes, such as Santa Fe Drive. T-REX did not have a 15-year construction period.</p> <p>The Association would like CDOT to provide either an alternate highway route or transit option before impacting the I-70 corridor with construction. This document does not provide state or local residents with alternate means of transportation through or around the I-70 corridor so that a construction period could proceed with minimal disruption. Alternate routes that could have provided an east to west travel option to I-70 were dismissed at the outset because of the social and economic impacts of these alternatives. Alternate local routes are all but nonexistent. Alternate modes of transit, such as a monorail (AGS) adjacent or further away from the current highway, should be considered so that construction does not impact the current highway operation.</p> <p>The Association is concerned that all of the CDOT preferred alternatives are less attractive than doing nothing at all for the next 20 years. The no action alternative would promote additional ski trips more than any other "preferred" alternative during the period from 2010 to 2025. The economic impact to our community based on the preferred alternatives may be devastating. Commuters that live on Floyd Hill but work in the greater Denver metro area will be inconvenienced with interchange and construction work in Jefferson County and may choose to relocate to gain acceptable travel times due to off-peak closures and delays. Recreational travelers will have to plan on delays and extended travel times for the entire construction period. According to this document, these same travelers will not have significantly improved travel times after the construction is completed. The Association would like to see the Colorado Department of Transportation provide solutions that will be significantly better than the current preferred alternatives.</p> <p>The Floyd Hill Area Property Owners Association is completely opposed to tolling for local residents. This study has identified tolling as an alternative funding source that would round out the required funding for the preferred alternatives. With no alternate routes and no alternative mode of transportation, tolling local residents is unreasonable. The Association would request that the report include alternate means of funding that does not include tolling of local residents.</p> <p>The Association would like CDOT to look at trends that are based on actual growth figures. The growth figures used by CDOT are not based on local (Clear Creek County) trends and are, therefore, questionable. Estimates of economic impacts should include consideration of very specific locales and not include the entire 9-county region as one economic impact zone. Clear Creek County does not have the same economic base as Summit County. Idaho Springs is not the same as Vail.</p> <p>With all due respect to the people that have put so much effort into this document, the document and the recommended alternatives miss the mark. The Colorado Department of Transportation has given the people of the state of Colorado and the residents of the Floyd Hill area preferred alternatives that will reduce the quality of life for us and our families for the next 15-20 years. The Association requests that CDOT look at alternatives that improve the quality of our lives and the lives of our children who will have to deal with the decisions made long after most of us will be able to drive.</p> <p>Respectfully,  Timothy T. Martinez President Floyd Hill Area Property Owners Association 941 Hyland Drive Evergreen, CO 80439 303-679-0556</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments	
382	Masica, Dick	Public	2/23/2005	<p>Good evening, My name is Dick Masica. I'm a full-time resident of Summit County and have been for the last six and a half years. And prior to that I was a part-time resident for about ten years.</p> <p>First of all, I'd like to compliment CDOT and the decision makers for taking the time and making this presentation -- frankly, I think it's outstanding. You all did a great job on that. And I don't admire the tough decisions that you have to make, there's no doubt about it.</p> <p>I would like to add something -- a comment in here that is off the subject. But I hope you don't forget about the importance and the urgency of fixing Highway 9 between Frisco and Breckenridge. I think that is a very pressing need that needs to be addressed as soon as possible.</p> <p>A comment on the presentation. I -- the first time I really heard or was aware of some of the subsidy and maintenance issues -- I don't know whether these are included in your budget number of 4 billion, but certainly I think that needs to be looked at on a net present value over the 25-year period that we're talking about.</p> <p>As far as the alternatives, to do nothing is totally unacceptable. I personally favor the combination of the mass transit with the six lanes. And I would feel very strongly -- as speakers before me have already mentioned, I think the highways have to come first, because as Bob French said, we are not going to change the highway culture of America while we're waiting to get this done.</p>	Transcripts		

Finally, in my view, the implementation period is totally too long. I think you all did a great job with the T-Rex project in Denver. I've lived in a lot of different parts of the county, and in my view, that was one of the best managed highway projects I've seen in the dozen or so places I've lived around the country.

I think back when John Kennedy was president. It was approximately nine years from the time he conceptually said, "I want to put a man on the moon by the end of the decade" and the time when Neil Armstrong took that first step. If we can do that kind of effort in less than nine years, there's no reason in the world why it should take us 15 or 20 years to get this job done. Good luck.

Thank you very much.

Categorized Comment	504	Mastin, Amy	Public	5/16/2005	<p>Your plans for expanding I-70 appear to be greatly influenced by the myopic views of Governor Owens regarding transportation ("2 Lane Bill is a well-deserved moniker") and the interests of the ski industry. The plan feels like an attempt to "build the church for Easter Sunday." The expansion of I-70 would essentially be addressing the 60 total Saturday and Sunday afternoons a year during which the highway fails. However, the weekend influx of visitors to western Colorado is already too large and expanding the highway will only exacerbate the severity of the situation. Our towns and the ski areas (if they gave it much thought) would benefit tremendously if visitors recognized that Saturday and Sunday are not the only days available to visit. It would be a better and SAFER experience for both the visitors, the ski operators and the towns themselves. (The ski areas on the weekends are getting to be dangerous places. How many more visitors can they really safely accommodate? The traffic in Silverthorne backs up on Highway 9 unbelievably and the town has no means of handling more. Breckenridge is a disaster at busy times and it's a small town in a narrow valley; what more can be done there?) The only way, however, to motivate visitors to abandon their reliance upon weekend visits is to NOT expand I-70. For example, I lived for a brief time in Boston. Cape Cod is served by a two-lane road, and only very foolish people would think that they could hop in their car at 5:00 on Friday afternoon and not sit in clogged traffic for hours. So, you adapt. You drive up at 10:00 on Friday or on Tuesday or on Thursday, etc.</p> <p>I would say, however, that there are some bottlenecks that should be addressed immediately (though it appears that money earmarked for I-70 has been allocated to SE Denver). One that comes immediately to mind would be to add a second west-bound lane on the hill between Georgetown and Silver Plume. That's a very steep hill and it only takes one semi or motor home to cause a huge jam. It looks as though the room exists to add the lane and it would be greatly beneficial.</p> <p>Overall, spending billions of dollars and 15 years to expand I-70 would be a monumental waste, catering to special interests. Visitors need to adapt. The highway is perfectly suitable 85% of the time and the 15% of the time that it does fail is not because of necessary travel.</p> <p>Thanks for your time in considering these comments.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Amy Mastin</p>	Online
---------------------	-----	-------------	--------	-----------	---	--------

Categorized Comment	536	Mastin, Kevin	Public	5/22/2005	<p>The current capacity of I-70 is already enough to make traffic in Summit County miserable at times. Summit County does not have the capacity to handle the flow we currently receive. Widening I-70 would be increasing the flow without enlarging the reservoir. We will overflow. I am opposed to significant widening of I-70 from Denver through Summit County.</p> <p>Emphasis should be placed on the opinions of the mountain residents rather than on those who live in the Front Range or those who work for Colorado Department of Transportation. We residents are the people who take great pride in our towns. We are the people who will have to live with the additional pressure of the highway, noise and pollution.</p> <p>It seems to me that the majority of the people pushing for major widening are promoting it so that Front Range skiers don't have to sit in traffic for a few hours on a few key weekends. Sure, I know that there are other rational reasons, but ski traffic is clearly the catalyst.</p> <p>I would much rather have Front Rangers change their driving habits than increase capacity for them on weekends. Let the Front Range visitor come up on a Tuesday in January, or a Wednesday in May. I know many local business who would love to have them on an off-peak hour or day.</p> <p>I do agree that there are a few sections of I-70 which could be improved. However, it seems that the communities most affected by the actual construction are against major widening. Clear Creek residents for example. Listen to their concerns. They are the people most affected and they should get to decide or vote on their future, it should not be imposed upon them by CDOT.</p> <p>We, in Summit County, already have some very poor traffic conditions caused by the volume that I-70 puts onto our local roads. Increasing I-70 capacity will make our local roads much worse: The confluence of Highways 6, 9 &amp; I-70 in Silverthorne is already awful. Traffic loads up Blue River Parkway to the north for blocks. Increasing I-70 capacity without a major overhaul of Blue River Parkway would be a bad decision. Traffic on Highway 9 between Frisco and Breckenridge is laughable on busy days. Increasing I-70 capacity without widening Highway 9 would be a bad decision. The load-up lanes at Copper Mountain on Highway 91, seem frustrating, if not outright dangerous. Does it say something that police are always present during ski days? Increasing I-70 capacity without fixing the Copper entrances would be a bad decision.</p> <p>In summary, I don't want Blue River Parkway widened to accommodate I-70; I don't want more traffic lights on Highway 6 to accommodate I-70; and I certainly don't want Highway 9 four-laned from Frisco to Breckenridge to accommodate I-70.</p> <p>I drive to Denver several times a month. The vast majority of the time I-70 is fine, good even. Traffic to Summit County is truly only a problem on high volume visitor days. That's really only 2 days per week, primarily between Christmas and Easter, plus several key weekends in summer. Even with every weekend in summer from Memorial Day to Labor Day included, that only totals 70 some-odd days. Further, the traffic on those days ties up only half of the interstate at any given time and only for a few hours westbound in the mornings and several hours eastbound in the afternoons. All of these hours totalled is a small fraction of the interstate's traffic time.</p> <p>If traffic was really heavy for 6 hours a day in both directions for 70 days, that's only 420 hours a year; about 4% of a year's traffic hours. \$4 billion for 4%?</p> <p>Might I suggest that a Church is being built for Easter?</p>	Online
---------------------	-----	---------------	--------	-----------	---	--------

Categorized Comment	233	Mauck, Tim	Public	1/26/2005	<p>Hi. I'm Tim Mauck from Idaho Springs, and I work for Clear Creek County.</p> <p>Clear Creek County is currently scheduled to complete the development of the greenway plan in May of 2005, which includes planning for continuous bike trails, associated river-oriented recreation facilities along the entire stretch of Clear Creek in Clear Creek County.</p> <p>Since the greenway plan is expected to provide the basic groundwork for significant investments towards economic and social improvements, considering the limited terrain in the county, it is encouraged that impacts to the greenway plan be considered as a part of the Tier I PEIS process.</p> <p>Without proper evaluation of environmental, cultural, and construction impacts of the proposed alternatives to the Clear Creek greenway vision during the Tier I PEIS process, economic, social, and recreational investment priorities identified by the Clear Creek County master plan 2030 run the risk of being prematurely precluded from future implementation for their desired experience and adversely affected.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
---------------------	-----	------------	--------	-----------	--	-------------

Categorized Comment	676	Clear Creek County Open Space	Counties	5/20/2005	<p>Clear Creek County Open Space Post Office Box 2000 Georgetown, CO 80444 (303) 679-2305 May 20, 2005</p> <p>Ms. Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>These comments are to be included in the Administrative Record for the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Project ID 0703-244</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy,</p> <p>The Clear Creek County Open Space Commission (CCCOSC) has serious concerns regarding the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). Thoughtful consideration and response to these concerns will be greatly appreciated.</p>	Written
---------------------	-----	-------------------------------	----------	-----------	--	---------

1. Under Section 3.14 and Resource Maps 3.14-11 through 3.14-14 of the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS, there are numerous recreation areas, trails and trailheads located within the three mile inventory area that are not documented including:
  - The 7:30 Trail north out of Silver Plume
  - The Silver Creek Wagon Road from Georgetown to Lawson on the south and east side of Clear Creek.
  - The Notch Trail south out of Georgetown towards Silver Plume
  - The Big Horn Sheep Viewing Area at Georgetown Lake
  - Numerous rafting, kayaking and fishing access points between Lawson and the I70/U.S. 6 Junction.
  - The Clear Creek County Whitewater Park in Lawson
  - The Beaver Creek Trail from the Easter Seals Camp to the Silver Creek Wagon Road.
  - Municipal parks within the Town of Empire
  - None of the Clear Creek County Open Space Areas including the Saxon Mountain Motorized Recreation Area, the Arrastra Site at Mill Creek, Alps Mountain, the Elmgreen Homestead, Beaver Brook Watershed, Sheepkeep Habitat Lands, and the Shockley Recreation Area.
  - The Silverdale Non-motorized Recreation Area.
  - The City of Idaho Springs Open Space.
  - The United States Forest Service Prospector (Interpretive) Trail leading from the USFS Visitor's Center.
  - The Spaghetti Ranch along Clear Creek at the Easter Seals Camp.

Nearly all of these sites were documented in the Clear Creek County Master Plan. Likewise, these properties and facilities need examination of 4(f) status and possibly included in 3.16 Section 4(f) Evaluation.

2. In Appendix M, Recreation Resources of the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS, impacts to fishing and boating resources should be analyzed. Major recreation nodes were identified in the Clear Creek County Master Plan along the I-70 corridor where fishing, trail access, boating and other recreational opportunities occur in the same areas. Clear Creek is the sixth busiest river in Colorado for Whitewater Rafting, and is an important economy.
3. Under 3.16 Section 4(f) Evaluation there is no consideration of historically used areas for fishing and boating, and the access points for those facilities. Again, both contribute significantly to the recreational resources of Clear Creek County and its economy. Most of the more important areas to these activities have been identified in the Clear Creek County Master Plan and the recently adopted Clear Creek County Open Space Plan.
4. Under 3.16 Section 4(f) Evaluation, and Appendix M Recreation Resources of the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS, the existing bike trail between the USFS District Ranger Station and the Big Five Bridge to the west is not identified.
5. Under 3.13-4 Section Recreation Resources, in addition to Idaho Springs, Clear Creek County also supports the rafting industry by providing multiple creek access locations along unincorporated Clear Creek County.
6. In the Executive Summary<sup>p 34</sup> the report states that the I-70 corridor "offers views of historic mountain towns and occasional glimpses of wildlife." Most residents of Clear Creek County find this erroneous. The viewing of wildlife is a constant fact of daily life. Floyd Hill is a frequent habitat of elk and many times a danger to traffic due to their frequent crossing of the highway. Big Horn Sheep are often seen grazing the grass next to the Highway close to the twin tunnels. From there they migrate to Empire and Georgetown where the Division of Wildlife has a viewing station on the east side of the highway. Deer roam the entire corridor, as well as fox, mountain lion and an "occasional" wolf. Wildlife crossings are a necessity in this area and should not be an afterthought. We would like acknowledgement that the area over the top of the twin tunnels provides an important and frequently used passage for deer and other wildlife. Game trails are visible from the frontage road. The report states that the corridor "offers views of historic mountain towns" however the necessity of sound barriers to mitigate the noise will destroy these views.
7. The study neglects to acknowledge the existence of the James Peak Wilderness area as well as the Mountain Evans Wilderness Area. Of the many Wilderness Areas addressed in the study, James Peak is the closest in proximity to I-70. The study suggests that the visual impact to these areas will be negligible due to less pollution when traffic moves smoothly as opposed to stop and go. It fails to take into account the stop and go traffic with 15 years of construction.
8. In the mitigation Summary, 3-19-1, it states that special consideration is given to the Genesee Bridge over I-70 since it is "the last glimpse of the Continental Divide from West bound I-70 until West of Silver Plume." This is incorrect. From Idaho Springs to the far side of Empire Junction there is a view of the snow covered peaks of the Continental Divide. This is approximately 8 miles of spectacular scenery. Special Design consideration should also be given to this section of the highway.
9. In the Cumulative Impact Analysis, p 4-31, the study states that "Planned future development will consume 32% of the Corridor View shed Area. Pressures for additional increased development from alternatives might alter the highly valued Corridor character from a rural mountain character to an urban character." This drastic change to the visual experience of the traveler and the residents was not taken into consideration when analyzing the visual impact of the preferred alternatives.
10. Health impacts. Where is it? The study indicates that with the improved flow of traffic there will be less pollution in spite of 150% increase in traffic. There is no mention made of the 15 years of construction with stop and go traffic. There are numerous studies that show increased health risks to those living and working within 250 yards of heavy traffic areas. Idaho Springs has 2 schools, a Recreational Center and a Senior Center within 100 yards of the highway. Carlson Elementary School has been at this location for over 100 years. Any detours during construction will take traffic on Colorado Blvd and within 10-15 yards of classrooms and the playground. Five historic churches are also located on Colorado Blvd which is the only alternate route through town. A study of the health impacts of the preferred alternatives should be included in this PEIS.
11. Environmental Justice 3.11 - In spite of the fact that the PEIS attempts to discuss affordable housing, I see no assurances that the small affordable homes in eastern and central Idaho Springs and Silver Plume that are extremely close to the existing I-70 will not be adversely affected if not eliminated. (the study mentions homes in western I. S. not being impacted) Some of these homes are occupied by elderly residents or low income workers who can not afford to purchase a home in another area. There is limited room in the valley to build alternative affordable housing. Clear Creek County has one lumber yard, one pharmacy and one supermarket. All are within approximately 25 yards of the existing I-70. Not only is the County and the low dependent on the revenues from these businesses, but the same is true of the residents. Elderly and low income populations often have limited ability to travel outside of the County for these services. 3.11.62 states that the exact extent of the direct impacts to low income and non-low income populations cannot be determined at the Tier 1 level. They do go on to state that the social effects, such as noise and diminution of aesthetic values would be the same for low income as for non-low income populations. How was this measured? It seems only reasonable to assume that those living next to the highway will be more heavily impacted than those living on the mountain side. This Environmental Justice information is invalid.
12. Economic impact: Since the majority of the construction will be in Clear Creek County and is estimated to take 15 years to complete, it is also reasonable to assume that the economic impact will be devastating. In spite of this, the PEIS does not make any attempt to evaluate the impact as a stand alone county. Recreational impacts are mentioned in the report, but the impact on Loveland Basin and the Rafting Industry may be enormous. The revenues from these activities contribute considerably to our County's economy. Do we have any assurances that the Creek will not be moved again? The study looks at the impact of nine counties averaged together, even though some of the counties are not in the I-70 corridor. This invalidates this part of the study.
13. HOV/HOT lanes. As indicated in the preferred alternative, one would enter at the US 6 Junction (Kermis) with I-70 and would not be able to exit until Empire Junction. Is this Economic Justice? Once traveling in this lane, it makes it impossible for one to exit into Idaho Springs for fuel, sight-seeing or to visit a restaurant. It also means that emergency services and residents cannot pass traffic jams and get to their destinations in Idaho Springs. This is a biased alternative in favor of through travelers.
14. The PEIS is a lengthy study that at first glance seems to cover a myriad of considerations. However, there are many deficiencies as mentioned above. There is no indication in the study as to how the various impacts were weighed in making the final determination of the preferred alternatives. Did the environmental and community values play a role in the decision or was it truly only based on cost?
15. Further consideration should be given to alternate routes through the mountains and long range plans for high speed mass transit.

Sincerely,

Timothy Mauck  
Coordinator  
Clear Creek County Open Space Commission

Categorized  
Comment

167

Maulis, Joyce

Public

1/15/2005

My name is Joyce Maulis. I live at 5180 Zenobia Court in Arvada.

Transcripts

And I'm concerned about the noise in Silver Plume. We have two cabins on the south side of Silver Plume. We are in the city limits, but we're on the west -- the service road that heads west. We're right at the very edge of the city limits. And when they put this wall in for -- the noise wall for Silver Plume, they forgot us. Because we're out on the very edge, the highway is as far from here to there, and the noise sometimes on the -- the 4th of July and those.

Categorized Comment	513	McComb, Martin	Public	5/18/2005	I live in Idaho Springs and my lifestyle will be directly impacted by CDOT's decisions. First, I use regional transit and do not want to pay a toll getting to the El Rancho Park and Ride. Second, I believe that any plan CDOT implements should A. only widen known congestion points (the tunnels for example) and B. emphasize improved public transit. Forcing people to share rides or use public transit is not a bad thing. I am an environmental scientist and read the PEIS thoroughly. It seems to me that the authors were stacked against public transit from the start and did not really consider its long term economic impacts nor the positive impact it would have on quality of life throughout both the corridor and front range. In addition, I believe the corridor's public recreation resources (trails wilderness areas, rivers) cannot handle the number of cars that widening the entire highway will bring.	Online
Categorized Comment	201	McCord, Patty	Public	2/20/2005	My vote is to avoid more road building with the removal of mountain sides and communities. This county and state need to be realistic about growth and being proactive. I am behind the tram or the best form of rapid transit that would get people up to the mountains w/the least amount of environmental impact. Europe is a dream to visit for this reason. We need to set the pace and keep our county and the state of Colorado beautiful AND accessible.	Online
Categorized Comment	25	McCutchan, Elbert	Public	1/10/2005	I find that having lived in Colorado in the 80's and traveling into the mountains many times over those years that something needs to be done to mitigate the traffic problems through the villages in the mountains. I moved to Seattle in 1988 while the state was finishing a project through the city of Mercer Island on I-90. They depressed the roadway and put lids over the highway to reduce the noise level of the traffic. It worked more successfully than anyone had hoped. I realize that there are other problems to address, but I feel that through Genessee, Idaho Springs, Vail, Silverthorne and Eagle this might be a viable, but not inexpensive solution. I am in the process of moving back to the beautiful state and hope to be in the mountains as much as possible. Traffic is a major concern of mine in this area.  Elbert McCutchan Mead, CO	Online
Categorized Comment	90	McDevitt, Mac	Public	1/26/2005	Please extend the planning horizon to 2050, increase the budget to that which will truly encompass advanced concepts. Give the rail (with turbo engine in each car) and AGW and honest look.  The corridor set aside for future use should never be able to be used for additional road lanes. The PEIS is ambivalent on this point.	Form
Categorized Comment	647	McGregor, Eileen	Public	5/19/2005	May 19, 2005  Cecilia Joy, Project Manager CDOT - Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011  Dear Ms. Joy,  Please accept my comments regarding the I-70 PEIS and give them serious consideration.  In reviewing the draft it appear that there are wildlife underpasses or overpasses recommended at many locations throughout the corridor study area. I urge you to list construction of these facilities as one of the highest financial priorities of the final plan, and that a specific and detailed near-term and long-term implementation schedule be included in the final EIS document.  I-70 is a virtual gun-shot to the head for wildlife. I have been commuting from Glenwood to the Eagle Valley for 13 years and I can't tell how awful it is watch a herd of elk decimated over the course of a few weeks by semi-trucks, how I have watched deer standing in the shoulder of Glenwood Canyon including the memorable time a fawn was trapped and couldn't escape over the jersey barrier, how I've seen beaver, marmots, coyote and fox flattened, and dozens of deer carcasses with legs in the air by Wolcott. We can do better.  Wildlife underpasses are needed quickly at Dotsero, Wolcott and Avon. I can't speak to the ones past Eagle County but it sounds like there are other zones equally or more fatal. Build the structures now, and extend them when and if the highway gets widened to six lanes, don't wait until then to install them. The overpass is absolutely the preferred method but in lieu of that and until the pilot project is built near Vail Pass, install other facilities. But build the one of Vail Pass soon. I have been to Bariff and seen the type that has been cited in local newspaper articles as being a model. I couldn't agree more - please do it, plan it, budget it, do it.  This message is plain and simple and I think you know firsthand what I am describing, we've all seen it and either turn our head to ignore because it's unpleasant, or we shake our heads and wonder how can it continue indefinitely. Why can't we do a better job to accommodate wildlife and provide them safer passage. Thank you for your time.  Eileen Caryl McGregor	Written
Categorized Comment	99	McGregor, Hamilton	Public	1/19/2005	Increased ski automobile traffic is the problem. Additional highway lanes will not solve the problem because moving more cars to the ski areas will require more parking at the resorts where space is limited. The solution is to have the skiers park near Denver and ride the train to Vail, the best option being the AGS Vail-to-C470. If a tourist can fly into DIA and catch a train to Vail...a Flatlander in a rented SUV in a snowstorm is an accident that can be prevented. I would think if the ski and tourist traffic is kept off I-70 that the existing 4 lanes would carry the through traffic for many years to come. My ideal solution would be your AGS Eagle County Airport to C-470, with bus in mixed traffic between Aspen and the Airport via Glenwood Springs. Go with the long view! Think of the jobs you will create! Please don't go with the bus in guideway. I believe that AGS, although more expensive to build, will be much more reliable and cheaper to operate in the long run. So build the AGS and preserve for 6 Lane Highway (option 7 reversed). It would seem far easier to build highway next to an elevated train than to squeeze the train into whatever median is left after building the highway.	Form
Categorized Comment	261	McInroy, Jack	Public	2/2/2005	I'm Jack McInroy, and I just happen to drive the corridor weekly on weekends. I'm not representing anybody but myself. And I don't have much to say other than the fact that we put this to vote two years ago when we had the money to do the study of the light-rail, and the motorists turned it down after the governor had something to say about it.  Many times, as I'm sitting in traffic, what a stand-up [INAUDIBLE DUE TO COUGHING] instead of this sitting in line. Anyway, I'm in favor of the light-rail or bus system. We have to do something. We have to think differently about our umbilical cord to our vehicles. We have to think about mass transit. Wouldn't it be wonderful if we had a system here in Denver like they have in Washington, D.C., where they [INAUDIBLE DUE TO COUGHING] to get around? Why can't we do that here?  Because we're all attached to our cars and can't give them up. It's ridiculous when you think of mass transit as an extension of the highway system, and I think it's ridiculous that by the time we got it built the cars -- the traffic would increase and it may be full again. So we're not gaining anything.  So my request to CDOT is to go ahead and do the mass transit. Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	447	McKelvie, Dave	Public	4/25/2005	Here's an idea to improve traffic for weekends between Denver and the tunnel on I-70. Install 1 new HOV lane from Denver to the tunnel. It would have only 1 exit (this is key), for Winter Park. West bound in the morning, east bound in the afternoon and evenings. Any alignment could be used. It would not have to be part of the existing highway, although it could be. This would be ideal for skiers and other weekend users. It would also get them off of the main I-70 and make everyone else's drive much easier. The cost has to be much lower than any other idea. It could be expanded to 2 lanes later.	Online

Categorized Comment	600	McRae, Ian	Public	5/24/2005	Dear Highway folks,  Thanks so much for all of your hard and thankless work. I would like to address a part of the PEIS that seems to have not recieved as much as attention as I hoped it would. Along I-70, between Bakerville and Loveland, there is an off the road area that is utilized by a great many folks. The Herman Gulch area. To those who don't know, it is an exit off the road, and that's all. But to me and so many others, it is so much more. Since the early 80's I have spent a great amount of time in the Herman Gulch area. I have hiked all the trails in the area, and a friend owns a cabin in the National Forest at exit 218. There are many cabins there, but you'd never know it. There are so many people that use that area that I'd like to suggest that you consider designating the area Activity Level A.  I know that this is asking a lot, but the noise mitigation would go a long way. I've always enjoyed the Herman Gulch area but the rumble of the highway down the hill has always stuck with me. Thank you for your time and consideration.  Ian McRae	Online
Categorized Comment	183	McWain, Elaine	Public	2/11/2005	These proposals not only affect Clear Creek Cty. and the State of Colorado, but the entire nation. It is shortsighted to keep making more room for automobiles. There is no such thing as an unlimited resource, certainly not petroleum. It is economically unsound to spend money on things that are bound to become obsolete. Mass transit is the only viable option at this time. The Europeans and the Japanese do it; we can too. Americans will have no choice and in the end, they will find it is more efficient, safer, and cost effective.	Online
Categorized Comment	459	Medina, Robert	Public	3/28/2005	March 28, 2005  Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011  Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228  RE: I-70 Development & SWEEP Plan  I have become increasingly concerned about CDOT's and Federal Highway Administration's lack of concern to develop an effective SWEEP plan to protect the water quality during I-70 construction.  You should be aware that Clear Creek near Georgetown is habit to Greenback Cutthroat Trout, an endangered and protected species. Moreover, Clear Creek near Golden will soon become a protected fishery by the Colorado Department of Wildlife. Without protection to Clear Creek, and other nearby watersheds during I-70 construction, you are endangering a precious natural resource.  I can assure you that if CDOT and the Federal Highway Administration do not take the proper steps to protect this watershed, I and many people like me will pursue this matter directly with Governor Owens, state legislative representatives, congressmen, and other government agencies.  I find it appalling that your agencies are expanding a highway so more people can quickly enjoy Colorado, while at the same time, destroying what makes Colorado special.  I will carefully track your performance on this matter, and gauge your efforts to properly protect this valuable watershed.  Sincerely,  Robert Medina Colorado Business Owner, Fisherman & Tax Payer 8601 Turnpike Drive, #100 Westminster, CO 80031 303.421.3380  cc: Mark Udall, Congressman	Written
Categorized Comment	423	Melcher, Albert	Public	2/23/2005	February 23, 2005  Colorado Department of Transportation C/O J F Sato and Associates 5898 South Rapp Street Littleton CO 80120  Re: I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS Public Hearing and Comments  The document "Highway Health Hazards" in both printed and electronic CD-ROM version is submitted for inclusion in the Public Comments on the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS, with the request that health risks of the types discussed in this document be addressed, properly studied and utilized in selection of a preferred alternative. The scientific studies identified in the document deal with significant health effects of toxic and other pollutants found in automobile and truck emissions. The effects of these pollutants include death and bodily impairment from cancer, asthma, heart illness, and even damage to fetal DNA. Decisions regarding major highway expansions have significant public health consequences. These must be taken into account given a "hard look" when comparing alternatives natives under NEPA.  Also, under the Federal Aid Highway Act (U.S.C §109(h), significant public health impacts must be considered in determining whether a project is in "the best overall public interest." The Highway Act requires that alternatives to highways be assessed to determine the costs of alternatives or mitigation measures that would "eliminate or minimize" the "possible adverse effects" of all highway pollutants. The mobility benefits of proposed highway projects are to be compared with the costs of measures that avoid or mitigate "such adverse impacts" in determining the selection of a preferred alternative that is "in the best overall public interest." This is, in this PEIS Draft, "incomplete information" relevant to significant adverse impacts that are reasonably foreseeable and essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives. Relative to the cost of alternative projects and of health impacts, the cost of acquiring the needed information and risk comparisons should not be considered as exorbitant. Certain "Environmental Justice" population sectors such as children and aged are generally impacted more severely than the general population.  Submitted by Albert G. Melcher 7504 East Jefferson Drive Denver Colorado 80237  The submitter is the Transportation Chair emeritus of the Rocky Mountain Chapter of the Sierra Club; this submission is consistent with local and national positions of the Sierra Club but is not submitted as being specifically reviewed and approved by the Executive Committee of the Rocky Mountain Chapter of the Sierra Club.	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
Categorized Comment	385	Melcher, Albert	Public	2/23/2005	My name is Bert Melcher. I live in Denver.  I'm transportation chairman emeritus of the Rocky Mountain chapter of the Sierra Club, and I just want to focus on one thing pursuant to the environmental sensitivity of the project.  Basically -- incidentally, I helped start the very first citizen's clean air organization in Colorado in the 1960s. It's been a major concern of mine, and as you know, Sierra Club nationally has been the leading citizen organization to protect your health, in the air, water, other aspects of safety and risks to our health.  I just want to talk about the health and air quality matters tonight and how important it is in the PEIS process. It is a factor, as Cecelia mentioned, in the sensitivity of the environment as regards to comparing alternatives.  Incidentally, more people die from air pollution caused by automotive traffic than they do to -- for -- in traffic accidents. Accidents take 43,000 lives a year, about one every 12 minutes. 70,000 deaths are attributable to air pollution from automotive sources.  In recent years there's a lot of new information and scientific studies. And, in fact, I just heard of one about a week ago that terrifies me. Fetuses -- the DNA in fetuses are damaged from air pollution when the pregnant women are subjected to certain air pollutants.  The Swiss are concerned about it. Their trucks will no longer go over Saint Gotthard Pass. They will be on a train through a tunnel. The tunnel's only 34 miles. The Swiss can do it, but I guess we can't.	Transcripts

I'm going to leave you a document I got from the Sierra Club on highway health hazards and submit it for inclusion in the public comments on this draft PEIS with the request that health risks of the types discussed in the document be addressed, studied, and given consideration in the preferred alternative. The scientific studies deal with significant health effects of toxic and other pollutants found in automotive and truck emissions. The effects of these pollutants include death, bodily impairment, cancer, asthma, heart illness, and even damage to fetal DNA, as I mentioned.

Decisions regarding major highway expansions has significant public health consequences. These must be taken into account. As NEPA says, Given a hard look -- as the courts say, Given a hard look when comparing alternatives under NEPA.

Also, the Federal Aid Highway Act, USC-109(h), significant public health impacts must be considered in determining whether a project is in the best overall public interest. The highway act requires that alternatives to highways be assessed to determine the cost of alternatives or mitigation measures that would eliminate or minimize the possible adverse effects of all highway pollutants.

The mobility benefits of proposed highway projects are to be compared with the cost of measures that avoid or mitigate such adverse impacts. And complete information -- and incomplete information must be filled in in an EIS process in addressing these matters.

Incomplete information is a -- not an acceptable finality of a project -- of an EIS. The cost of acquiring that information, unless it's exorbitant, and it generally shouldn't be considered exorbitant given the billions of dollars we're talking about -- the cost has to be considered if it is exorbitant, but if it is not, it's not an excuse for not doing the proper analyses.

The conclusion is that I think great weight should be given to nonpolluting transit. Capital cost alone does not capture the socioeconomic and the human cost, but further study in developing complete information of these problems in the EIS will help us all make a better decision.

Thank you very much.

Categorized Comment	360	Melcher, Albert	Public	2/16/2005	<p>My name is Bert Melcher of Denver, Colorado. Thanks for the opportunity to speak tonight. As a former commissioner of the Colorado Department of Highways before it was transportation, I've been involved with context-sensitive design on I-70, the Hogback, and when we came into Vail and so forth. And I've worked with CDOT closely, and I praise them for some of their work in the documents.</p> <p>Jeff, as you know, I think the environmental stewardship guide is a top-notch document. Environmental stewardship is really the essence of our problem. CDOT's stewardship guide deals with small projects primarily, and what they're doing here is dealing with a situation that transcends typical highway stewardship. We're talking about statewide stewardship in our state and in our part of the country.</p> <p>We have some fundamental questions to ask. At some point rapid transit in the corridor will be essential given population growth. Will this be 60 years from now? 40 years from now? 20 years from now? The Rocky Mountain chapter of the Sierra Club -- I'm former transportation chairman -- feels the time is now, not 20 or 40 years off. If you continue with the set of present approach, of what I call, fail accomplish, and make the six lanes and then the next six lanes, and the next six lanes, then we come back and start over with eight lanes up to there, where do we draw the line? I think that the line should be drawn immediately, and we should foster the rapid transit solutions.</p> <p>The weight and significance of community and environmental values and characteristics must be a major driving force -- it's a stable environment for future generations. That's going to be critical. The vision for the corridor would exist on that. This is lacking, and some of the details in the PEIS indicate that lack.</p> <p>Just a couple of examples: Noise. If you look at cross sections, you will not see these sound walls. Envision driving on the highway with 10- or 15-foot-high sound walls. You're a visitor to Colorado; do you want to see Colorado or do you want to see the other side of a sound wall?</p> <p>If you have a health issue -- I'll state it very clearly. This is not listed in the impacts. Human health. If you can't breathe, nothing else matters. Let's pay attention to that.</p> <p>I'd like to talk a little bit about the 20-year cost and the \$4 billion figure. Rapid transit can be funded with 30-year bonds to -- let's say a 5-year build-out period, the last bond can be paid off 35 years after their mission. That would be -- I knew I'd have to stop. But that would give us, instead of \$4 billion, 6 billion or more of funds available during the bond -- is paid off period. Quite different from what we've seen.</p> <p>I will stop. But I think Adriana Raudzons just presented our statement. I'll leave copies of that, plus a copy from some Sierra Clubbers who asked me to notify you that they want transit and good environmental protection. So thank you very much.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	171	Melcher, Albert	Associations & Special Interest Groups	1/15/2005	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to be here. My name is Bert Melcher, Denver, Colorado. I am a member of the Mountain Citizen Advisory Committee. Today I'm representing the Sierra Club and Colorado Republicans specific to the research group. I want to make one comment wearing that hat, then make a couple of personal comments that are strictly my own individually.</p> <p>First of all, I'd like to add my advice to the request of the time extension. This is a massive, enormous document and it's a massive, enormous decision facing the people of Colorado, and I think given the time and the circumstance, that an additional review period by the public on the draft is very definitely in order.</p> <p>Now, on the personal comments, first of all, I was a little disturbed by the implication that transit is subsidized and the rest of our automotive system is not. There are many, many subsidies, direct and indirect, for the automotive system. The FHWA -- Ron has done studies on these back in 1997. I think somehow it would be advisable to state the accurate comparability of subsidies, or at least make sure the public is advised of them.</p> <p>The second comment is, the \$4 billion cutoff point is artificial, and I think it's economically unsound. One commenter spoke about the future maintenance costs of this. I did a study in 1997 -- I served on the State Highway Commission back in the 1960s. I was concerned about how the highway financial needs were growing relative to the change in population and VMT, and I compared -- I looked at when I was on the commission in '67 versus the 1995 figures. The highway needs, fairly legitimate, were growing at thirteen and one-half times the rate of the population growth.</p> <p>What it says is that the more we pave, our maintenance and operation costs keep digging us into a further financial hole. We are certainly seeing that right now. This needs to be considered.</p> <p>And the \$4 billion capital construction cost has absolutely nothing to do with the future costs that future generations will bear. I think it should not be used as screening criteria.</p> <p>I have 30 seconds. What more should I say? It's artificial, I think. And there are other sources of funds that really need to be looked at along with the highway funds and so forth that Tom Norton mentioned as part of the limiting criteria for funding this.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	73	Melcher, Albert	Public	1/15/2005	<p>I spoke on 1/15/2005 at Westminster about the increasing deficit of projected needs for funds versus available funds for CDOT compared to population growth and VMT growth. The needs vs. available deficit is growing 13.5 times as fast as the population is growing. This trend is getting us deeper and deeper into a financial hole.</p> <p>The point relevant to I-70 Mountain is that the total future construction plus M&amp;O cost needs to be considered, that the \$4 billion capital cost cutoff is artificial and bad economics, and that a low-future-cost transit system with higher front end costs and longer economic life may be by far the best economic decision. I also noted that transit is subsidized, but so is our auto system.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	821	Melcher, Albert	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	<p>continued from comment number 781</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	781	Sierra Club	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	<p>Sierra Club Rocky Mountain Chapter 1536 Wynkoop Street Suite 4B Denver CO 80202 May 24, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer</p>	Written

Federal Highway Administration  
12300 West Dakota Ave  
Lakewood, CO 80228  
(Via Cecelea Joy)

Dear Ms. Joy and Ms. Wallace,

Re: I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

The Rocky Mountain Chapter, Sierra Club, is pleased to submit formal comments on the subject Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Draft PEIS). These comments are an attachment to this letter. We appreciate the opportunity to comment, and any critical comments are intended to assist the Colorado Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, reviewing agencies, non-governmental organizations and the general public in arriving at the best decisions for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans and Colorado citizens.

We look forward to continued participation on the Mountain Citizen Advisory Committee.

Sincerely,

Albert G. Melcher APA  
Transportation Chair

CC: Susan LeFever, Chapter Director

COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY  
THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN CHAPTER, SIERRA CLUB  
TO THE COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

on the  
I-70 MOUNTAIN CORRIDOR DRAFT  
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

May 24, 2005

Rocky Mountain Chapter, Sierra Club  
1536 Wynkoop Street Suite 4B  
Denver CO 80202  
303-861-8819  
www.rmc.sierraclub.org

Comments are provided on general matters and on specific items in or regarding the subject Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT.)

#### I. GENERAL COMMENTS

##### I.1. The Need for a Supplemental Draft PEIS: Full Disclosure of Significant Information

A. Under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), CDOT shall prepare a supplement to either a draft or final EIS if "the agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns" or if "there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts." See, e.g., 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9(c)(1)(i). A supplemental EIS (SEIS) must be treated just as a DEIS by the agency. Id. at § 1502.9(c)(4). This requires that the SEIS be circulated for additional public comment to allow the public, as well as other federal, state, and local agencies, an opportunity to review and comment upon the changes to the proposed action, as well as the potential environmental consequences, before the actions is made final. Id.

With respect to the I-70 draft PEIS, there is little doubt that a supplemental draft is needed for several reasons as presented below. It is requested that a supplemental Draft PEIS (DPEIS) be issued and a reasonable time allowed for public comment. The rationale for this request is as follows.

B. Since the publication of the Draft PEIS, new information of significance to public and organization comments on the Draft has been provided to some parties but others have not been informed of such information. At various meetings that MCAC and public organization members have attended, important information has come to light. Sierra Club has found out about some of it from non-CDOT sources. One source involves the Clean Water Act as brought to light at a Continuing Legal Education Conference and discussed below. The Sierra Club and other environmental organizations with which we communicate have heard that some people or groups have obtained some important information but others do not know of it.

A critical document that was not distributed to the Mountain Corridor Advisory Committee (MCAC) of the PEIS or to outside organizations is the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) report of June, 2004, on the Colorado Maglev Project. This deals with the major transportation alternative of the Advanced Guideway System (AGS.) The AGS is an alternative discussed at length and screened out (as will be discussed later.) The FTA report is very briefly referenced in the Draft PEIS. Notice of its availability should have been proactively provided to the MCAC members and major Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO). It is not on the CDOT or PEIS web site, even as a link to FTA or other location.

C. The CDOT I-70 Mountain corridor has this information (as of May 14, 2005) in a "FAQ" section: "What is the role of the MCAC in identifying the preferred alternative? Extensive public and agency involvement activities have been conducted as part of the PEIS process, including meetings with the Mountain Corridor Advisory Committee (MCAC), public open houses, and the federal interdisciplinary team. The MCAC members will be consulted for their insights according to the constituents they represent. CDOT and FHWA will also have the responsibility for consulting with the federal cooperating agencies and considering the view of the general public in the determination of a preferred alternative." It is not known when said consulting with MCAC members will take place. However, based on what has been stated by the public at Hearings, it appears desirable for the results of the hearings, the MCAC consultation, and other significant and post-Draft process such as the Rural Resort Region Coalition Consensus process to state its preferred alternative, to be made available for review and comment in a Supplemental or Revised Draft PEIS.

D. In the Public Hearings and in the Rural Resort Region and Northwest Council of Governments (NWCOCG) "Coalition Consensus" Consensus Workshop process (Silver Creek, Colorado, May 5-6, 2005), it is known that there has been considerable discussion of "context sensitive design." In general, CDOT has stated that context sensitive solutions (CSS) will be utilized to the feasible extent. The cost of the various alternatives in the PEIS can change radically by the degree of application such more expensive design. The CDOT web site cost information is not clear in cost per mile and number of miles of various types of design. As an example, the Glenwood Canyon construction would cost about \$80,000,000 per mile average in today's dollars.

Further pursuant to the capital cost presentation, transit can be built in segments and funded over a longer period than 20 years – the cutoff time frame used in screening in the PEIS. This would get a transit alternative into the range below the \$4 billion capital cost cap, which is in and of itself arbitrary and capricious.

One of the most critical and powerful reasons for developing a supplemental DPEIS is the need to revise and redefine the final alternatives. See I-8 below.

Hence the entire cost presentation in the Draft needs to be restated and re-submitted to the public for their understanding and comment, inasmuch as it is of the essence in the selection of alternatives. It is noted that the participants in the aforementioned Silver Creek Workshop spoke strongly supportive of this matter.

E. There is at least one agreement between CDOT and another Agency of significant importance and relevance to the letter and intent of NEPA and related laws and to analyses and decisions regarding the environment that could be affected under actions resulting from this PEIS. One that is known but which warrants CDOT disclosure and full information involves CDOT and the US Army Corps of Engineers under the Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. (Reference: "NEPA" Conference, Continuing Legal Education, Broomfield CO, February 3-4, 2005; presentation by Tim Carey, Chief, Omaha District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Littleton, CO, pages E-11 to E-17 of Conference Notebook.) There appears to be one or more documents on a "merger process and agreement" in the implementation of the Corps responsibilities under the Clean Water Act Section 404. In the referenced conference, Mr. Carey spoke that a basic agreement was developed between the Corps and CDOT. He responded to a question by stating that the Corps and CDOT have agreed to a process wherein it is assumed that the Tier 2 impacts and permits will be acceptable to the Corps and that a ROD can be issued in the PEIS process on the basis of this assumption. It is apparently derived from correspondence of May 12, 2003, between the Council of Environmental Quality and the U.S. Department of Transportation. This affects the determination of the "Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative" (LEDPA) in the

Section 404 context. We have subsequently been informed that the Corps will not issue any final document until it has reviewed the comments on the Draft PEIS. This is of extreme significance to matters of environmental quality, to the letter and intent of NEPA and to the concerns of the Sierra Club. We do not find any reference by CDOT to this in the Draft PEIS. We do not know how many documents are or may be involved, what their implications and processes are, or why they were not disclosed. If CDOT designs and alternatives and the "Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEPDA) do not coincide in a project, what is the process to resolve this condition, and what environmental protections or damage might be in order?

Unless the Corps of Engineers has proper information prior to any form of endorsement of approval of a Final Alternative, it should maintain an independent and non-committal posture vis-a-vis CDOT. Impacts analysis under NEPA should be done up front so that an agency "will not act on incomplete information only to regret its decision after it is too late to correct." See, e.g., *Davis v. Mineta*, 302 F.3d 1104, 1114 n.5 (10th Cir. 2002) (NEPA is intended to focus the agency's attention to environmental consequences and to provide relevant information needed for forming and implementing an agency decision); *Blue Mountains*, 161 F.3d at 1216 (quoting *Marsh v. Oregon Natural Resources Council*, 490 U.S. 360, 371 (1989)). The Sierra Club would not want the Corps to be in a position of regretting a premature decision.

We request that information on the Corps of Engineers "Purpose and Need" statement for the I-70 Mountain Corridor statement be provided by CDOT to the environmental community for review and comment, as it is as germane as the CDOT Purpose and Need as regards water resources. This is especially true because, as noted elsewhere herein, CDOT terminated a program called "Streams and Wetlands Environmental Enhancement Program" (SWEEP) that was intended to develop mitigation measures. Information from this program probably would have been useful to the Corps of Engineers.

F. There may be other such agreements affecting matters. Examples would include Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act and the State Historic Preservation Officer, Section 110 of the Historic Preservation Act, the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act, or other laws. It is requested that CDOT provide a listing of all relevant Acts (Ref. CDOT Environmental Stewardship Guide, March 2003) with a notation for each relevant Act or agency that no such agreements exist, or that they do exist, with the inclusion of any such agreements. The public cannot comment adequately on the PEIS and its environmental impacts without such knowledge. The public, without this knowledge, can be deceived into assuming that protection from other laws and regulations is in force but in actuality may have been impaired or affected by agreements between CDOT or FHWA and protective agencies. Full disclosure is in order and is requested.

G. What is not revealed to the public may be more important than what has been revealed in the PEIS. The essence of this condition is that commenters on the Draft PEIS are not commenting on the same material; there is not a "level playing field" for commenting. These conditions contravene all principles, guidelines and requirements for disclosure and public comment. A supplemental Draft or redraft is needed to rectify these deficiencies.

H. NEPA mandates that an EIS take a "hard look" at and discuss the likely adverse environmental impacts of a proposed action. 42 U.S.C. § 4332(c). This discussion must include the environmental impacts of the alternatives, including the proposed action, any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented, the relationship between short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources that would be involved in the proposal if implemented. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.16.

The draft PEIS fails to address or inadequately addresses some significant adverse environmental impacts associated with a number of significant matters as discussed below.

I. The cutoff and screening out of the "Minimal Action" alternative and alternatives over \$4 billion in capital cost and 20 years of fund flow are arbitrary and capricious and are not in consonance with NEPA.

#### 12. The Need for a Supplemental Draft PEIS: Erroneous and Misleading Information

A. The Draft PEIS is fraught with erroneous and misleading information and is grievously deficient in significant material that is essential for informed public comment. Agencies must obtain that information if it is relevant to a reasonably foreseeable significant impact, is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives, and the overall cost of obtain it are not exorbitant. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(a). *Colorado Env't Coalition v. Dombek*, 185 F.3d 1162, 1172 (10th Cir. 2002). This applies to information on potential impacts and to measures to avoid or mitigate potential impacts. . Alternative specific mitigation measures and their associated costs are not provided, making an alternative comparison difficult. A reasonably complete discussion of possible mitigation measures is a critical component of NEPA. Without such a discussion, neither the agency nor other interested groups and individuals can properly evaluate the severity of the adverse effects. *Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 352 (1989). The CEQ regulations emphasize that agencies shall "include appropriate mitigation measures already included in the proposed action or alternatives." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(f) (emphasis added). Under the CEQ regulations, mitigation means:

- (a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
  - (b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.
  - (c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment.
  - (d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.
  - (e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.
- Per 40 C.F.R. §1508.20, the draft PEIS is legally inadequate with respect to CDOT's obligation to discuss reasonable mitigation measures. There is considerable discussion of specific matters in the balance of this document.

B. Page 1-2 has a box about CDOT's Environmental Stewardship Ethic and it quotes from the Environmental Stewardship Guide. (We quote from the Guide in Section 1-10 herein.) The box contains this excerpt:

"Consistent with CDOT's Environmental Stewardship Guide, both FHWA and CDOT are committed to identifying and establishing programs to enhance and potentially improve existing aquatic and terrestrial habitats influenced by I-70. These programs include CDOT's Stream and Wetlands Ecological Enhancement Program (SWEEP) and A Landscape Level Inventory of Valued Ecosystem Components (ALIVE). The role of SWEEP is to develop a plan for the management practices and enhancement of the ecosystems (including fisheries) associated with the streams, wetlands, riparian areas, and watersheds in the Corridor. The ALIVE program will target management strategies for high value conservation sites to wildlife, including federally endangered and candidate species, and develop cooperative agreements with regulatory and resource agencies. In addition, resource agencies have defined wildlife crossings needed along the Corridor. The Record Of Decision (ROD) will outline a process for implementing these programs."

Unfortunately CDOT decided to abandon SWEEP in 2002, and the PEIS is totally lacking in acceptable commitments to mitigation in a manner that has support from knowledgeable members of the environmental community. Any reference to SWEEP such as the one quoted above is egregiously misleading. There are a number of references to SWEEP in the document and all are deceptive.

In investigating the status of the ALIVE program, the Sierra Club cannot find evidence that its recommendations are readily available for public review, and we have some information that some of its critical recommendations are misstated in the PEIS. The ALIVE program focuses on wildlife crossings and barriers and is very important regardless of what alternative is selected. Hence, the quotation above should be clarified to the public and more information should be presented. If this information does not justify the quotation above, then that would be considered to be a misrepresentation. The ALIVE committee recommendations are very important in the cumulative effects and ecology considerations discussed in Chapter 4 of the Draft and later in this document.

#### 13. The Need for a Supplemental Draft PEIS: Alternatives

A. A major concern and cause for a Supplemental PEIS is the types of alternatives and their design/engineering parameters retained for the final group of preferred alternatives – including the Rail, AGS and Minimal Action screened out of the "Preferred" group. As well as those in the DPEIS the variations and comments raised in this comment period are highly relevant. Included in that category are the comments presented at the NWCOG Coalition Workshop, May 5-6, Silver Creek. Many recommendations for a new set of alternatives were heard at that time.

The Sierra Club calls for a Supplemental DPEIS with a revised set of alternatives for the following reasons.

B. The DPEIS screening based on \$4 billion capital cost and 20-year funding is arbitrary, capricious, unrealistic and unjustified. Rapid transit can be built and funded in phases, and can be kept under the capital cost limit of the DPEIS (2). The cost comparisons are deceptive: the Rail and AGS costs are based on construction from C-470 in Metro Denver to Eagle County Airport, while the highway alternatives are for segments to be built in the 20-year period. Hence there is an apples-to-oranges comparison. Also, this gives an erroneous impression that the economic lives of the alternatives are equal. The C-470 to Eagle County Airport Transit alternatives will have a 50-year or more life. The 6-lane highway proposed will be obsolete by 2030 and more capacity from C-470 to Eagle County Airport will have to be built. These equivalent times and mileage give an apples-to-apples capital cost comparison.

C. The cost of highway improvements in the DPEIS is deceptively low. The DPEIS public comments at hearings and the NWCOG RRR Coalition participants all call for "context sensitive" design and environmentally protective design. However, to provide this, the true cost of highway construction, even for the segments proposed, could well exceed that of the transit alternatives screened out. There will be many miles of highway where "Glenwood Canyon" design will be essential for a host of environmental reasons. Cut-and-cover may be the only acceptable solution in several communities. If Glenwood



Canyon's old two-lane expansion to four lanes were built today, it would cost about \$80,000,000 per mile. What "Context Sensitive Solutions" (CSS) mean to a highway engineer and what they are to community denizens and tourists are two different things. The former is often unacceptable; the latter is essential and expensive. A Supplement DPEIS and the MCAC should address this, and ensure that context-sensitive highway construction cannot be negated by an inadequate budget. The DPEIS "footprints" (cross-sections) in Chapter 2 do not present an honest picture of their potential adverse environmental impacts, or of mitigative/avoiding designs and "context sensitivity" at certain mileages and locations.

D. A fundamental and fatal flaw in the DPEIS and one important adjunct to it is that economics alone are used to screen alternatives. One exception is the "Minimal Action" which is screened out because it may suppress future traffic volumes. In a NEPA process, screening should give proper weight to non-cost factors. NEPA seeks to insure that "presently unqualified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decision-making along with economic or technical considerations". This has not been done in Level 3 screenings, as described in pages 2-3 to 12 in the Draft, and certainly not in the level cost – only screening for the "Preferred" alternatives.

E. Since the DPEIS was published, a variation on the rail alternative has been proposed by a Consultant with high credentials: CDOT and the NWCOG are aware of it. Unlike the AGS alternative, it does not require expensive R & D and a cost-competitive segment, C-470 to Frisco, may be economically competitive with highway widening alternatives. This should be given fair evaluation. It would be elevated, third rail power pickup, and electric motor or Linear Induction Motor.

F. It is noted that funding mechanisms for all or part of all alternatives are a problem and the factors of institutional arrangements and funding as discussed in Section 3.3-3 of the DPEIS, are critical. Ideally, it would be desirable for all affected governmental entities to proceed with diligence, celerity and alacrity to address those matters prior to CDOT selection of a Final Alternative.

In light of the above, all economic figures presented in Section 2. 3. 7 and Chapter 5 of the Draft are inaccurate and need to be revised in a Supplemental DPEIS for public review and comment.

G. CDOT's Environmental Stewardship Guide has text stating: "A preferred alternative should be identified by the CDOT staff if a preference exists in order to assist the public comment process." This is good guidance, in our opinion. The number and range of alternatives in the Draft PEIS should be reduced to one or two preferred alternatives in a Supplemental PEIS.

H. Further comment on alternatives and screening is made in Section I.10 herein.

#### 1.4. Programmatic "Tier 1" Policy-level PEIS and Site-Specific "Tier 2" EIS.

The PEIS is a Tier 1 policy-level National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document." (DPEIS Page 1-1). It enables program decisions to address corridor-wide system issues.

The entire process since 2000, and the Draft PEIS, in actuality have been both a Tier 1 and a Tier 2 study. The DPEIS places less emphasis on "policy" than on data and detail found in any Tier 2 EIS, such as the present NorthWest Corridor EIS, the US 36 Corridor EIS, and others. At the policy level regarding funding mechanisms, it has some analysis, but the results are used only for screening alternatives and not for addressing how to effect changes and set new policies. A level of decision is defined for specific alternatives, rather than just alternative modes and general alignment based on preliminary engineering, which is more appropriate to a Tier 1 study. New institutional mechanisms such as multi-jurisdictional multimodal authorities and public-private partnership development are policy-level decisions. Policy considerations of land use planning and transportation-land use relationships warrant extensive and intensive examination. One such matter should be an improved integration of the CDOT corridor eastern terminus with the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG), the MPO with jurisdiction extending into the eastern-most corridor section. Another factor could be serious discussion of multimodal funds at the State level. Colorado at present is one of a very few states that has never devoted any State or flexible Federal funds to public transit (FTA and other "pass-through Federal funds" excepted). National policy issues such as greenhouse gases energy conservation, sustainability and non-renewable resources should be priority concerns in a PEIS.

At Tier 2 level, this Draft includes about the same level of preliminary engineering and location-specific environmental data and analysis that is developed for a typical project EIS. It has page after page and table after table describing specific impacts for comparisons and screening of alternatives, quantifying acres of wetlands impacted, numbers of buildings, miles of streams, tones of sand, etc. in a final Draft for a typical Tier 2 EIS, it is common to state one alternative as the preferred one with the next level of preliminary engineering and impact analysis. To proceed from this "Tier 1 plus 2" document with an array of alternatives directly to a final alternative, and with inadequate and erroneous impact analysis, is an unacceptable practice in the implementation of NEPA. A Supplemental PEIS, if properly and thoroughly accomplished, could be an acceptable bridge between this mongrel PEIS and one suitable for justifying the selection of a final alternative.

In the two volumes of the DPEIS, in the deliberations of the Mountain Citizen Advisory Committee since 2000, and in Hearings and processes involving local officials, location-specific data, analysis, impact issues, and preliminary engineering are about at the usual level of a Tier 2 EIS.

Cumulative Impact Analysis (CIA) and attention to Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) should be given attention in this PEIS process in selecting an alternative that maximizes positive policy concerns. One such "community value" policy factor is the desire to change Corridor visitors' travel "behavior" in a meaningful way with the introduction of transit (from prior MIS, page ES-1, DPEIS). This is a Tier 1 CSS application. Other comments on specific Tier 1 policies will be made herein, as will comments on the Tier 2 factors in the Draft.

#### 1.5 Sustainability

A. Many of NEPA's requirements and purposes – trustee of the environment for future generations, beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, a balance between population and resource use, promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere – are encompassed within the overarching term "Sustainability".

The U. S. Department of Transportation and others are translating that broad concept into more specific goals, practices and applications.

The Sierra Club policies and practices and the following few comments from the vast literature on sustainability are in accord, especially as regards automotive emissions, greenhouse gases, and energy conservation.

B. Irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources are inherent in sustainability and are in CEQ regulations:

\*40 CFR Sec. 1502.16 Environmental consequences.

This section forms the scientific and analytic basis for the comparisons under Sec. 1502.14. It shall consolidate the discussions of those elements required by sections 102(2)(C)(i), (ii), (iv), and (v) of NEPA which are within the scope of the statement and as much of section 102(2)(C)(iii) as is necessary to support the comparisons. The discussion will include the environmental impacts of the alternatives including the proposed action, any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented, the relationship between short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposal should it be implemented. This section should not duplicate discussions in Sec. 1502.14. It shall include discussions of:

- Direct effects and their significance (Sec. 1508.8).
- Indirect effects and their significance (Sec. 1508.8).
- Possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, State, and local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned. (See Sec. 1506.2(d)).
- The environmental effects of alternatives including the proposed action. The comparisons under Sec. 1502.14 will be based on this discussion.
- Energy requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- Natural or depletable resource requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- Urban quality, historic and cultural resources, and the design of the built environment, including the reuse and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- Means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts (if not fully covered under Sec. 1502.14(f)).

[43 FR 55994, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 873, Jan. 3, 1979]

The Draft PEIS does not comply with this regulation.

#### 1.5.1 Greenhouse Gases and Global Warming

The Sierra Club and the environmental community in general consider global warming and greenhouse gas emissions to be one of the greatest, if not the greatest, threat to the well-being of future generations and the biosphere.

A policy-level EIS is sadly defective if it does not consider how various alternatives impact greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) and global warming. As a simple example, rapid rail transit emits far fewer greenhouse gases per passenger-mile. Hence, at a PEIS Tier 1 level it rail transit is preferable to a highways-only alternative that results in an increase in Vehicle Miles of Travel and resultant emissions of greenhouse gases. About the gas reductions in this 144 mile corridor if transit is instituted effectively are small in the scope of global greenhouse gas emissions, the Sierra Club is of the opinion that the term "significant" is indeed applicable to decision-making in the I-70 Mountain Corridor as input in

deciding between the alternatives.

One can argue that a single project will not have a significant effect in changing the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere or in altering global warming and climate change. However, global warming is caused by one power plant after another, one energy-inefficient car after another, one energy-inefficient building after another. Similarly, it can be favorably impacted by the use of one hybrid car after another, one "green" house or office building after another, one development of transit after another.

One can also argue that, because the Federal Government has no policy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, a PEIS or EIS can ignore such gases, global warming and the information in Appendix A herein. The Sierra Club holds that any PEIS or EIS based on the phraseology and intent of the Draft PEIS is not in compliance with NEPA.

To substantiate the need to implement transportation modes and policies that reduce GHG, several documents selected from the vast literature on the subject are presented here.

It is noted that even the U.S. Department of Defense and many major oil companies are seriously concerned about global warming and depletion of non-renewable energy resources. For CDOT and FWHA to continue to assume that the future will continue to be viable if past policies and practices are not changed is not a responsible or defensible posture.

We are of the opinion that the Tier 1 analysis and content of this Draft PEIS are deficient in respect to sustainability and the NEPA principles and terms encompassed therein, and that Sustainability factors should be used to compare the alternatives in the Draft.

The standard definition of sustainable development from the Brundtland Commission is creatively ambiguous: "Humanity has the ability to make development sustainable – to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." This malleability allows programs and institutions of government, civil society, business, and industry to create their own emphases on what is to be sustained and what is to be developed, but over time a consensus has emerged around three pillars of sustainable development: economic, social, and environmental. Sustainable development is also defined through the goals it seeks to achieve, through the indicators by which it is measured, through the values that support it, and through the practice by which it is attained. ("What is Sustainable Development? Goals, Indicators, Values, and Practice") Kates, Robert W., Thomas M. Parris, and Anthony A. Leiserowitz. 2005 Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development 47(3): 8-21.  
[http://sustainabilityscience.org/lists/docs/whatisSD\\_env\\_kates\\_0504.pdf](http://sustainabilityscience.org/lists/docs/whatisSD_env_kates_0504.pdf)

DOT has defined five strategic goal areas covering safety, mobility, economic growth and trade; human and natural environment; and national security. For each goal a set of strategic outcome goals and a number of more specific performance measures are defined for use in the annual performance planning. The four strategic outcome goals for the environment are qualitative:

1. reduce the amount of transportation-related pollutants and greenhouse gases released.
  2. reduce the adverse effects of siting, construction and operation of transportation facilities.
  3. improve the sustainability and livability of communities through investments in transportation facilities; and
  4. improve the natural environment and communities affected by DOT-owned facilities and equipment.
- (USDOT- 2003 Performance Rep. 2004 Performance Plan, Washington, D.C.  
<http://www.dot.gov/PerfPlan2004/index.html#>)

If sustainability is defined primarily in terms of energy consumption and air pollution emissions, the best solution is more efficient and cleaner vehicles. Hybrid cars are now commercially available that are three times as fuel efficient as the fleet average and produce minimal air emissions. But driving such a vehicle does not reduce congestion, road and parking facility costs, most consumer costs, accident costs, mobility problems facing non-drivers, or the environmental impacts of roads and sprawl; in fact, by reducing vehicle operating costs, it tends to increase these problems (Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, 2004a). When all impacts are considered, strategies that improve travel options, create more accessible land use patterns, and reduce total automobile travel are generally most sustainable. Table 1 (of the Litman Report) compares benefits of impacts of efficient vehicles, shift to transit and ride-sharing, shifts to non-motorized modes; and examines benefits of planning objectives:

- ☑ Energy and Emissions Reductions
- ☑ Congestion Reduction
- ☑ Road & Parking Cost Savings
- ☑ Crash Reductions
- ☑ Improved mobility for non-drivers
- ☑ Increased Public Fitness

Shifting to more efficient vehicles helps achieve one or two planning objectives. Shifting modes and reducing total vehicle travel achieve many objectives. (Source: "Well Measured: Developing Indicators for Comprehensive and Sustainable Transport Planning. By Todd Litman, Director, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, 5 April 2005.)

With the transportation sector responsible for significant emission of greenhouse gases and likely to be affected by the changing climate, making the transportation system more sustainable will require addressing both mitigation and adaptation.

☑ The US needs to begin to limit emissions in the near term as it develops and implements a long term plan in order to increase the likelihood that important detrimental climatic thresholds will not be exceeded.

☑ To ensure attention is paid to the likelihood of adverse impacts from climate change, NEPA analyses should include consideration of resilience to the range of expected changes in the climate.

"Climate Change and Sustainable Transportation: The need to End Our Addition to Fossil Fuels" Michael C. MacCracken, Senior Scientist for Climate Programs, Climate Institute, Washington DC July 12, 2002 Introducing Sustainability into the Transportation Planning Process Transportation Research Board (<http://trb.org/conferences/sustainability/MacCracken.pdf>)

Preparing for climate change can improve overall resilience to multiple stresses and reduce the likelihood of many adverse impacts. Addressing the potential impact of climate change in the context of other stresses has the potential for most efficiently reducing overall vulnerability and limiting exposure to multiple stresses.

Appendix A, a report by the International Energy Agency, is included as part of this text but is located as an Appendix for formatting clarity. It is but one of countless reports and studies that are relevant.

### 1.5.2 Energy Conservation and Dependence on Non-Renewable Resources.

A. If CDOT selects an alternative without full analysis and disclosure of implications and comparisons of alternatives as regards energy use, it will have ignored a resource concern of NEPA and a factor affecting the economical mobility of travelers within, to and through the Corridor. This is a policy-level and program level aspect of the PEIS. CEQ Regulations 40 CFR 1502.16 states "shall include discussions of . . . (e) Energy requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures." Thus far, CDOT is inadequate in such analysis and documentation. Section 3.18, "Energy" and especially Table 3.18-2 are inadequate and are indeed deceptive.

Referring to Table 3.18-2, the daily operational energy requirements of "Rail with IMG" are 40.8 terajoules and those of 6-lane highways are 43.3 terajoules. According to the American Public Transportation Association "2003 Public Transportation Fact Book" (page 59), on a passenger-mile basis, commuter rail uses only 31% as much energy as automobiles, and light rail uses only 22% as much. Table 37 gives an energy consumption of 911 Btu per passenger-mile for heavy rail, 1,152 Btu per passenger-mile for light rail, and 5,255 Btu per passenger-mile for autos, SUVs and light trucks. Those figures are similar to Section 3.18 for autos, but 3.18 does not give figures for rail similarly.

Even given the modal splits presented in the DPEIS, a 5.77% difference between "Rail with IMG" and "Six-lane Highway 65 mph" daily energy consumption is more realistically assessed on the basis of Btu/passenger-mile per year and per planning horizon in comparisons of alternatives. If 20% or so of travelers per passenger-mile are on heavy rail instead of cars, 4,334 Btu are saved per passenger-mile, or a reduction of about 83% of the per passenger-mile energy.

University of Denver and Colorado School of Mines students presented similar figures on energy comparisons on a preliminary basis in Idaho Springs, May 5, 2005.

CDOT should totally revise Section 3.18 consistent with the above comments, and should (1) present all assumptions on an "apples-to-apples" basis. Over a 25-year or 50-year planning horizon, travelers will have a far lower cumulative energy consumption pattern if a transit alternative is developed, and non-renewable resources will have a much lower adverse impact. All of Table 3.18-2 is suspect, and it is irrelevant to Tier 1 policy and program considerations.

Section 3.18-2 mentions "Mitigation Measures to Reduce Energy Consumption". This discussion is rapid and meaningless as regards comparison of alternatives. Rapid development of excellent transit is not mentioned by CDOT. This would avoid or mitigate adverse effects on non-renewable resources. It would give Corridor residents and travelers an estimate of long-term energy costs and supply/demand factors as regards their choice of modes and future economic viability, given the realism of the following policy-level material. It would bring Colorado into the camp of those who would work to ensure that future generations are not disenfranchised by travel costs due to high petroleum costs and a lack of choice in transportation modes. Future petroleum availability and cost cannot be precisely quantified or predicted, but sufficiently dependable studies have been made to indicate that the future will not replicate the past period of relatively cheap oil.

The Denver POST (April 12, 2005) reported a succinct statement of the problem by economists Peter Buchanan and Jeffrey Rubin at CBC World Markets in Toronto:

"The U.S. consumes 10 percent more energy than it did in the 1970s because of larger houses and cars, longer trips and greater use of air conditioning, they say. A growing world economy also is putting strains on capacity and prices. "If you look over the next five to six years, there's not enough growth in capacity to keep up with the expected 2.5 percent growth in global demand," Buchanan said in an interview."

The major implications of energy consumption that should be used in a Tier 1 level screening of alternatives transcends Table 3.18-2, even though it is a deficiency in and of itself as discussed above.

Appendices B-1 and B-2, excerpts of reports by the International Energy Agency, are included as part of this text but are located in the Appendix for formatting clarity. These are but two of countless reports and studies that are relevant.

#### 1.5.3. Time Frames and the PEIS

A. The present highway alternatives are a form of "segmenting", given "reasonably foreseeable" travel demand growth after 2030 in Ten Mile Canyon, Mount Vernon Canyon, Eagle County and perhaps elsewhere. By CDOT's own statements, and as was noted at a NWCOG presentation to Vail Town Council on March 15, 2005, the highway alternative will be obsolete by five years after it is completed.

B. The basis planning and forecasting time frame utilized in the DPEIS is 25 years. The PEIS and public comment in Hearings call attention to longer-term planning and visioning, looking 50 years or more into the future. Although 50 years is not a long time, technological change could well be enormous, but it is noted that the last 50 years have seen little change in basic infrastructure and urbanization forms and patterns; a long term future is locked in for many factors despite the potential for technological change. Reasonably foreseeable considerations after 2030 should be given weight in decisionmaking. These might include

- High energy costs due to global supply-demand
- Reduced travel by car due to high costs of fuel
- Most vehicles will be fuel efficient and less polluting
- Transportation funding will have to have other sources than gas tax or gas taxes will have to be very high
- Global warming will have a climate effect on Colorado; a worst case scenario which climate modelers currently express is a drier climate, less snow, less runoff
- Front Range population could be 6,000,000 or more (Department of Local Affairs: State 2030 forecast is 7,150,000)

The Appendices of the Section on "Sustainability" in this document are directly relevant to some of these matters.

It would be highly desirable to (1) have more attention devoted to this by qualified "futurists" and (2) give appropriate weight to selecting an alternative with longest potential use with minimal rebuilding and without exceeding continual capacity increases that transcend the environmental quality "carrying capacity" of the Corridor.

#### 1.7. Public Participation

##### 1.7.1. NEPA mandates citizen participation.

A. One mechanism used by CDOT was a Mountain Corridor Advisory Committee (MCAC), created in June 2000. It was to provide "input from diverse points of view, to represent an inclusive and balanced array of affected interests." The group is not a decision-making body, nor does it provide input by consensus. From June 2000 through 2003, over a dozen workshops were held for the MCAC to hear about and discuss the topics being studied and the methodology of the studies. Its membership is primarily public officials; there is very little citizen organization membership. The broadbrush environmental organizations had exactly one representative, and several limited-interest environmental organizations had representatives. The Sierra Club, for purposes of these comments on the Draft PEIS, does not find any major or fatal flaws regarding the MCAC, but on the other hand, CDOT will be misrepresenting the MCAC if any further PEIS documents are made to indicate that it was very successful in meeting the intent of NEPA. A number of members with whom we have conversed felt that most of our input was not taken seriously and not acted on. The consultants listened and replied that they would take the input under consideration, but the item often died after that. As a result it appeared that attendance dwindled. It has been, in short, a "mixed bag."

B. However, the process and NEPA were seriously abused when there were no MCAC meetings in the entire year from December 2003 to December 2004, when critical decisions were made about the selection of Preferred Alternatives and the screening criteria of capital cost and funding time frame was developed by CDOT. This constitutes a significant failure in communications. If meetings had been held during the development of these matters, it is highly probable that the final group of alternatives would be different from those in the Draft and that statement and many of the flaws and grievous problems mentioned here would not have occurred. The Sierra Club urges that FHWA ensure a more productive and candid approach for the balance of the PEIS process.

C. Certain analyses that are questioned in this document would have been more effective with proper public participation. For example, see the comments later herein under "Visual Resources." The legitimate and well-meaning efforts of members of the public to obtain information on the analytical methodology, conclusions and background material were rebuffed. Similarly, the "Cumulative Analyses" process and output would have been different and significantly improved. CDOT might have taken a "hard look" at various elements that integrate into cumulative effects, and might have brought in adequate "reasonably foreseeable" prospective future conditions such as energy supply and global warming influences as discussed herein under "Sustainability," Project effects on global warming and energy use are relevant. These factors are also relevant as "reasonably foreseeable including indirect actions" inputs as "future actions" (such as travel costs) into the "Cumulative Impact on Individual Resource" analysis as per the diagrams in FHWA guidance on cumulative input analysis ("Questions and Answers Regarding the Consideration of Indirect and Cumulative Impacts in the NEPA Process", FHWA Environmental Guidebook.)

##### 1.7.2 The Interstate 70 Central Mountain Transportation Corridor Coalition ("Coalition") Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with CDOT is relevant to public participation.

A. It involves thirty member governmental jurisdictions in an I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition. This has been supported by CDOT, financially and functionally, in a process to develop a consensus on a "Preferred Alternative." The Coalition is not a complete and proper representation of governmental jurisdictions in the PEIS study area. The Denver Regional Council of Governments and various municipalities near the east terminus are not involved. Hence, by virtue of its composition, this I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition is a limited special interest and its comments and reports to CDOT must be treated in such a context.

B. Although it was created to be part of the NEPA process, its role is limited. The MOU very clearly states this: "No redetermination of Alternatives." By entering into this MOU, the Parties recognize and agree that CDOT does not endorse or pre-approve any Regionally Preferred Alternative that might be identified by the Coalition. Any Regionally Preferred Alternative proposed by the Coalition will be considered by CDOT and FHWA along with all other reasonable alternatives identified as part of the NEPA process and I-70 West PEIS."

The MOU states: "The Parties understand and agree that the Coalition's efforts are supplementary to the NEPA process and I-70 West PEIS being undertaken by CDOT." The Sierra Club has had members at some of the community meetings of the Coalition and at the two-day Workshop at Silver Creek, Colorado, on May 5-6, 2005. Based on our observations of the process, the efforts are at best supplemental and we call upon CDOT and the FHWA to treat them as such.

Even though the members of the Coalition and the working groups are dedicated and well-intentioned public servants, it is evident that NEPA and environmental matters are beyond their ken. The Coalition as a whole, as well as the Technical Team, could have used a course on NEPA, ecosystems, cumulative impacts and analytical methods. Very few of the members have any knowledge of these items and they were not considered in the evaluation of the PEIS. One member of the Technical Team referred to NEPA as the "National Environmental Protection Act." The Coalition made a very limited attempt to bring a modicum of information on environmental considerations to its PEIS members. On April 21, 2005, five experts made brief presentations to the membership on wildlife, water and air quality. The 30-member committee's attendance had dwindled to fewer than 15 people when these presentations were made. By no stretch of the imagination can it be construed that any legal requirement relating to NEPA and the proper EIS process was satisfied.

A second factor that disenfranchises, disengages, dissociates, detaches and disconnects the Coalition from NEPA was the dictum under which it operated that all environmental factors and impacts are equal in this PEIS at Tier 1 level. It was told by CDOT that all attention to EIS factors is to be deferred to Tier 2 projects. This is despite the vast material in the Draft PEIS addressing EIS factors and requirements, laws of reviewing agencies and the results of considerable studies. The vague references to "context-sensitive design" and the general need for mitigations at projects can hardly be a hard look or an interdisciplinary analysis. For example, Environmental Justice was mentioned just once in the two-day workshop, and air quality differences between trains and cars was not mentioned. Hence, the Coalition process and any findings must be viewed as an interesting exercise in "political facility engineering" and as disqualified from contribution to the NEPA process.

Augmenting the disconnect from NEPA is the fact that a number of affected governmental entities were not involved in the Coalition and its workings. At the east end of the study area, various municipalities did not participate. Metro Denver jurisdictions representing over 2,500,000 people - tens of thousands of which travel to the mountains for recreation and other purposes - were absent from the Coalition. The Denver Regional Council of Governments, whose boundaries extend into the Corridor study area and which has responsibilities as an MPO, along with Clean Air and clean water duties, was not involved.

The structure and facilitation of the Workshop required extensive attention to the highway alternatives and very little discussion of transit, and any report will show a bias as a result, even though the participants almost unanimously agreed that rapid transit and a full system with networking must be established. There was a split in opinion on timing – soon or eventually but not urgent.

The Coalition did not involve members of environmental or other NGO's or any diversity of special interest groups.

I.7.3 Front Range involvement has been inadequate. Both the general public and the governmental units in the Front Range have remained largely uninvolved. The reasons are not evident, although CDOT has not been proactive in this regard. It has not made much use of the media in generating interest in the EIS. It is important that this condition change drastically before further decisions if the intent and requirements of NEPA are to be complied with.

I-7.4 Communications with the Sierra Club. On May 6, 2005, Sierra Club sent an email to CDOT and FHWA (April 15, 2005) requesting a general meeting to elicit questions and answers from environmentalists and others in the Front Range. It also asked that new post-Draft information be conveyed to us. The Sierra Club MCAC representative ("Melcher", Transportation Chair, Rocky Mountain Chapter, hereinafter the first person in this paragraph) was told by CDOT Project Manager (Cecelia Joy, May 6, 2005) that if I would state what material I wished to see, I could set up a meeting with CDOT. The problem is that the only way to state what I have not seen is for CDOT to publish - fully and in a transparent manner – an enumeration of material developed or presented to a limited and not general audience. One cannot be expected to know the unknowable or to be a clairvoyant about such new information. The aforementioned email was replied to by FHWA (April 19, 2005), informing me that the staff was considering my request and would respond shortly. As of May 17, 2005, no further communication from FHWA has been provided. This contravenes the principles of acceptable public participation.

I.7.5 Public Survey by "Our Future Summit," A Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) in Summit County. The results of that survey are shown here.

(Pie chart shows 5% No action [but continue \$532 million in already planned improvements] – 7 responses; 14% Minimal Action – fix "choke" points, modify travel demand [\$1.3 billion] – 21 responses; 28% Minimal Action + create long-term transportation strategy [\$1.3 billion] – 41 responses; 0% Widen highway to 6 lanes [\$2.4-2.7 billion] – 0 responses; 47% Build mass transit – bus guideway, rail or monorail [\$3.3 – 6.2 billion] – 67 responses; 3% 6-lane highway + space for future mass transit [cost to be determined] – 4 responses; 3% 6-lane highway + build mass transit [cost to be determined] – 5 responses)

Total: 145 responses

#### I.9 Comparison of Alternatives: Methodologies and Screening.

A. NEPA requires that federal agencies provide a detailed evaluation of alternatives to the proposed action in every environmental impact statement. This discussion of alternatives is essential to NEPA's statutory scheme and underlying purpose.

[The alternatives] section is the heart of the environmental impact statement. Based on the information and analysis presented in the sections on the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, it should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decision-maker and the public. In this section, agencies shall:

- (a) Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives
- (c) Include reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency
- (d) Include the alternative of no action.

Source: 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14.

The draft PEIS fails to address a legally appropriate range of alternatives. The aforementioned Silver Creek Workshop of NWCOG participants offered cogent and valid points regarding this failure. In our opinion, given the screening criteria for carrying forward "preferred" alternatives, the DPEIS violates the requirement to include an appropriate range of alternatives both because it includes too many similar alternatives and has failed to explore other alternatives that are more environmentally protective (rail variations, etc.)

#### B. Legally Insufficient Weighing of Environmental Considerations

The screening makes legally improper evaluations of certain protected environmental values. It does so by treating all values equally in the scoring process. The screening ignores the mandatory legal standards that attach to protection of wetlands, threatened and endangered species, and 4(f) resources (i.e., parks, open space, archeological and historic sites). By law, avoidance of harm to wetlands, threatened and endangered species, and 4(f) resources takes precedence over protection of other environmental values which, while important, do not carry special statutory protection. The Screening is fatally flawed because it eliminates from consideration viable alternatives that would have less impact on one or more of these protected values.

The DPEIS purports to analyze impacts to parks, open space and recreational areas, which it recognizes to be 4(f) resources. Under 4(f), 49 USC § 303(c), parks, open space and recreational areas must not be used for highway projects unless there is no prudent and feasible alternative. Screening seems to be based more on "practicability" instead of a mandatory avoidance standard. "Practicability" has no place in 4(f) analysis. Thus, screening used undefined, inappropriate standards. There is no attempt to cumulate the harm to 4(f) resources, making it impossible to objectively review the project team's analysis. Equal weight is given to all environmental factors whereas it should give more weight and screening emphasis to factors for which special laws are relevant.

These matters refute the fallacious CDOT-Coalition position discussed elsewhere herein that all alternatives have equal impacts at the Tier 1 level.

I-9.1 Effects on Items of Section 3. Revisiting and revising alternatives will affect the statements and conclusions in parts of DPEIS Chapter 3, "Affected Environment And Environmental Consequences." As just one example, page 3.4-26 states that the rail alternatives will cause some increased stream sedimentation because they are located in the highway ROW. An alternative that locates them outside of the highway ROW will eliminate the increase and the statement will not be valid.

#### I.10 Comparison of Alternatives.

A. CDOT's "Environmental Stewardship Guide" of March 2003 states that, in November 1996, the Colorado Transportation Commission adopted as a matter of policy the Department Mission, Values, and Goals. One important value recognized by the Commission for implementation is: Making decisions which are compatible with Colorado's quality of life, environmental, and economic goals. Further, "The Commission has also adopted Statewide Transportation Policies. Among those policies, two directly address CDOT's commitment to the environment to support its environmental ethics statement. These CDOT policy statements incorporate many of the NEPA principles and are implemented throughout CDOT procedures and decision-making.

##### • ENVIRONMENT

CDOT will promote a transportation system that is environmentally responsible and encourages preservation of the natural and enhancement of the created environment for current and future generations. We will incorporate social, economic, and environmental concerns into the planning, design, construction, maintenance and operations of the state's existing and future transportation system. With the active participation of the general public, federal, state and local agencies, we will objectively consider all reasonable alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse impacts.

##### • BALANCE QUALITY OF LIFE FACTORS

CDOT recognizes the complex interrelationship of the environment, economic vitality and mobility, and is committed to balancing these factors in the development and implementation of the statewide transportation plan. By working with local, regional and state interests, CDOT will advocate the development of a coordinated decision-making process that balances the long-range transportation, land use and quality of life needs in Colorado. It is not the intent of the Commission or CDOT to prohibit or interfere with local land use decisions."

"CDOT has adopted the following environmental ethics statement to guide its

work and accomplish its mission: CDOT will support and enhance efforts to protect the environment and quality of life for all of Colorado's citizens in the pursuit of providing the best transportation systems and services possible.

CDOT goes beyond environmental compliance and strives for environmental excellence.

• CDOT promotes a sense of environmental responsibility for all employees in the course of all CDOT activities.

• CDOT ensures that measures are taken to avoid or minimize the environmental impacts of construction and maintenance of the transportation system and that mitigation commitments are implemented and maintained.

• CDOT designs, constructs, maintains, and operates the statewide transportation system in a manner which helps preserve and sustain Colorado's historic and scenic heritage and fits harmoniously into communities and the natural environment."

The evidence in the PEIS screening of alternatives is that this PEIS process is not in compliance with the CDOT Commission policies.

B. If it could be assumed that the full intent of NEPA were to be given proper consideration in the decisionmaking process, an evaluation and screening of alternatives would be quite different from one based primarily on cost and highway engineering parameters. Throughout the PEIS, all comparisons of impacts between the alternatives are as "Least, Intermediate and Greatest." This is helpful, but at this

stage in the game, a different and more valuable method is in order. A method needs to clearly portray whether alternatives are, as regards impact considering avoidance or mitigation of adverse impacts, either acceptable and/or enhancing, or adverse and/or unacceptable. The general degree of such should be indicated. This approach would find the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative and would screen out alternatives that should not be permitted.

Tables 2-25 and 26 not only provide a "Least, Intermediate and Greatest" rating but also rank alternatives relative to each other. This is useful information and we would not strenuously disagree with most of the information in them, if one access the merits of the "Least, Intermediate and Greatest" approach. The tables are devoid of policy issues and the air quality information is not in accordance with any requirements about health and visibility. The noise information for Lawson, Dumont, Downville, Vail, portions of the Eagle Valley, Jefferson County and parts of Frisco is highly suspect and not logical. Historic values analyses are totally indefensible in Table 2-26. Other color shadings and rankings also can be challenged, but this document is not the proper medium for a dissection of the entire tables, nor would the Sierra Club presume to attempt such an exercise without the involvement of more organizations.

However, we are of the opinion that a rating of alternatives using true environmental and policy-level factors, consistent with the CDOT Environmental Stewardship Guide, the FHWA Environmental Guidebook, CEQ regulations and guidelines, is essentially as follows:

- ☒ PEIS Alternatives are grouped and include variations on PEIS alternatives include those screened as not meeting \$4 billion capital cost and 20-year funding period.
- ☒ Evaluation Ratings: Plus sign = Acceptable and/or Enhancing;
- ☒ Minus sign = Adverse and/or cause to Reject.
- ☒ Ratings are Relative Comparison ratings.
- ☒ Both construction period and longer-term aspects are integrated in these ratings.

I.11 Re suppression of travel demand. The Draft on page ES-14 and CDOT in Hearing and other presentations dismiss the "Minimal Action" alternative as not meeting 2025 demand and hence, there will be a suppression of travel due to travel times. Suppression is only about 2%; that is not severe or high enough to screen out the alternative. The responsibilities of a traffic planning agency to "meet forecasted travel demand" could justify such screening out; i.e., if they do not meet demand they are not doing their job. Despite the aforementioned responsibility, the decision at both public policy level and comprehensive planning level transcends the responsibilities of CDOT. FHWA and CDOT are not the right authorities to be making such a determination. Ideally, local officials and planning processes - mountain and Front Range should be working with constituents to make the determinations.

#### I.12 Predetermined Outcome.

A. The major evidence that there was de facto predetermination is well sated by Mr. Bill Astle, MCAM Delegate for Jefferson County; "I think the biggest mistake in the whole process occurred when the decision to define the corridor's eastern terminus as the hogback (C-470/70 intersection) was made.

Without bringing the segment from DIA to the hogback into the picture the whole process became distorted. It also was very unfortunate that the relationship of the I-70 corridor to the general movement of people in the metro area (which would have brought RTD into the process) was excluded. I have no doubt that these actions were taken to bias the result towards highway solutions."

B. The methodologies, the Coalition process, and some of the ratings and rankings in the Draft have suggested to a number of people that there is a predetermined outcome to this PEIS, even if this is not the case, the bias to continued highway development is evident. The capstone to this is the capital cost and funds criteria in screening.

C. On May 21, 2005, the subject of the DPEIS was addressed on Denver television Channel 4, KCNC, on a program called "Colorado Getaways." The brief segment about I-70 on the program dealt with impacts on historic Clear Creek County. CDOT spokeswoman Stacey Stegman was interviewed. From her remarks and those of the reporter who paraphrased her remarks, it was evident that CDOT had already decided to adopt the "Six-lane Highway" Alternative. The predetermination of the outcome of a PEIS process is evident. It is hoped that Ms. Stegman misspoke.

#### I.13 Aesthetic, Visual and Experiential Quality

A. The USFS Visual Resources Methodology presented in Section 3-13 is a well-accepted and valid process, and is augmented by some limited images and simulations. It needs to be read in conjunction with Chapter 2

In general, the visual resources section does not convey an acceptable analysis of the elements about the public is concerned. One of the problems is that the various pictures and simulations do not adequately exhibit what either the traveler or the person on the ground—resident or tourist—will see and feel. Simulations of Idaho Springs from a rabbit's-eye view above the town are rather meaningless.

B. The key to impacts is the "footprint" of facilities. The Draft Chapter 2 has many diagrams, but sound walls, intrusion on streams, rock cliff cuts, etc, are not shown. Sound walls will be needed to mitigate noise at communities. People on the highway won't see the valleys and towns outside. "Tourists: Come to Colorado's mountains: See our great concrete walls!" The simulations of sound walls in the PEIS are not very good representations.

The issue of noise walls versus aesthetics and visual resources leads directly to a critical paradox for the six-lane highway alternative and any wide-footprint alternative. Avoiding or mitigating adverse impacts on other environmental elements and ecosystems by utilization of "context sensitive solutions" will alter the visual characteristics and conclusions stated in the Draft. Water resources and 404 permitting is a good example; a Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative may be an elevated section of highway, which may constitute a severe reduction of scenic and "sense of place" quality. (One unfortunate example of this exists at the top of Vail Pass, where there is a huge and most unattractive CDOT building for housing sand to prevent it from washing into Black Gore Creek.)

C. Miles of degree of impact is interesting in comparing alternatives, but it is not an indicator of quality and value. It is useful in estimating how much context-sensitive design is needed and hence project cost. We can, even with a brief examination of the conclusions of Section 3.13, see why there is significant controversy about the visual resources conclusions in the Draft. With local citizens, walking some of the entire route and identifying topographical modifications (cliffs, slopes, water-related topography and vegetation) is needed to augment the material in the Draft.

D. The magnitude of concrete and its configuration are important. The extent of concrete in an auto-dominant system includes not only the highway (as shown on page 2-44, for example,) but also the intersections, urbanized parking – often adjacent to intersections where service and food service is located- all combine to change the character of a place. A driver westbound at the entrance to the Central City Parkway is exposed to this condition, as well as to the insult of the Parkway itself. The nature of a small highway with a median and without crowding or modifying the natural terrain and vegetation highway is one thing. Eliminate the median, add a median barrier, shoulders, perhaps sound walls or berms, crowd and damage the natural terrain and vegetation, increase the expanse of pavement, and it is a significantly different facility. The visual analysis and presentations in the Draft fail to adequately identify this phenomenon, despite the brief discussion of "Indirect Impacts."

Long term, more highway development will induce more indirect impacts and pavement and will more Central City Parkway opportunities. The visual and aesthetic experiences of Colorado will degrade badly.

E. Visual perceptions combine with other factors to create a Cumulative Impacts concern with the whole being greater than the sum of its parts. A "sense of place" of the critical historic values recognized by Colorado Preservation Inc. (CPI) integrate with the visual character and quality, with the mind's eye sense of what our early settlers went through, with the feeling of being at oneness with the entire "setting." This is why people live in the Colorado Mountains. This is why the Front Range people live near and go to the mountains. The sterile visual analysis misses the essence of public concerns; it lacks a sense of quality of experience. "The grasping of subjective meaning of an activity is facilitated through empathy (Einfuehlung) and a reliving (Nachertleben) of the experience to be analyzed." (Max Weber German sociologist, 1864-1920.) Re "Einfuehlung": "When, moreover, we consider that the expression of the more complex and definite emotions is dependent upon the expression of ideas of nature and human life, we see that the process is really a single one. Feeling is a function of ideas; if, then, we demand sincerely in the one, we must equally demand conviction in the other. The poet could not convey to us his pleasure at the sight of nature or his awe of death unless he could somehow bring us into their presence. The painter could not express the moods of sunlight or of shadow until he had invented a technique for their representation. Clear and confident seeing is a condition of feeling." ("The Principles of Aesthetics" by Dewitt H. Parker.)

F. Re public participation in "Visual Resources" in Clear Creek. The Draft gives the impression that someone took some pictures and did a USFS method academic exercise and called it good. If the public were to have been involved properly in the visual analysis, we have no doubt that the outcome and report would have been very different. Our discussions with key participants in the affected area validate this. In short, reasonable public participation was not allowed.

G. The name of the person or persons responsible for the "Visual Resources" Section, 3-13, does not appear in the List of Preparers.

#### I.14 Formal Sierra Club Position

Sierra Club Rocky Mountain Chapter Summary Position on I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) Of the Colorado Department of Transportation

May 24, 2005

**¶** We urge that a redraft or supplemental Draft PEIS be issued for further comment because

- o There have been a number of new events and new information matters, not all of which are known to, or available to, those making comments
- o There are serious and significant deficiencies in the environmental analyses and information in the Draft
- o The Alternatives in the Draft must be revised, and new ones and variations must be studied
- o The capital cost and funding period screen must be altered to show phased transit with longer financing period and true costs of acceptable "context sensitive solutions" and design.
- o The opinions of the Rural Resort Region Coalition should be made public for comment and a proactive effort should be made to involve Front Range public and governmental agencies in the Draft PEIS process
- o All interagency agreements affecting the NEPA process, such as with the Corps of Engineers, should be made public and subject to the same public participation as is the Draft PEIS itself, all of these are not identifiable in the Draft but must be revealed.

**¶** We oppose additional highway lanes, including the "No Action" Alternative and components of the "Minimal Action" alternative such as additional safety improvements only, until an item-by-item justification and re-prioritization is completed.

**¶** We support a transit system of local service and the regional "Rail Alternative" of the PEIS with modifications for any potential rail configuration

- o Elevated structure
- o Electric Rapid Rail (Third rail power, electric motors or Linear Induction Motor)
- o Independent of highway right-of-way, with minimal "footprint" and surface impact
- o Build in phases with spurs from main line to high-volume destinations and an integrated feeder and distribution network
- o Capable of early engineering and design with existing components and technology, no significant R&D needed
- o Construction and operation to commence as soon as feasible.

**¶** Reasons for adoption of these alternatives:

- o Sustainability, including greenhouse gas reduction, efficient use of non-renewable resources, minimizing vehicle miles of travel; avoiding irreversible adverse impacts
- o Sustainability of community integrity and quality of life
- o Minimal environmental impacts including water resources, wildlife, ecological health, air quality including human health risk and haze/visibility impairment, and preservation of historic and cultural features and values
- o Traveler choice and opportunity to change travel behavior
- o Environmental Justice
- o Potential for more efficient land use, development patterns and infrastructure
- o Preservation of natural topography and vegetation and aesthetic quality
- o Minimal "footprints", maximum "Context-Sensitive Solution" and design
- o Quality of Life and Quality of Environmental Experience for residents and visitor: Colorado and Front Range, National and International.

**¶** We urge the rapid establishment of new institutional mechanisms such as a Mountain Regional Transportation District to plan, develop and operate the system, with new sources of funding and public-private partnerships as appropriate, for the rapid rail and other elements of the system and network.

**¶** We recommend that there be a maximum integration of transportation and land use planning and development.

#### National Sierra Club Policy

The Sierra Club supports transportation policy and systems that:

- minimize the impacts on an use of land, airspace and waterways, minimize the consumption of limited resources, including fuel, and reduce pollutant and noise emissions;
- provide everyone, including pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, with adequate access to jobs, shopping, services and recreation;
- provide adequate and efficient goods movement and substitute local goods for those requiring long distance movement, where feasible;
- encourage land uses that minimize travel requirements;
- strengthen local communities, towns and urban centers, and promote equal opportunity;
- eliminate transportation subsidies which handicap achievement of the above goals; and ensure vigorous and effective public participation in transportation planning.

Adopted by the Board of Directors, February 19-20, 1994; amended May 7-8, 1994

"The United States has entered the 21st century relying on dirty, polluting 19th century fossil fuel technology. It is good for America's environment, economy, health, and climate to use energy more efficiently, to develop clean alternative sources of electricity, and to use more efficient methods of transportation. We must begin to look towards a cleaner, healthier future." (Sierra Club web site on Sprawl.)

#### I. SPECIFIC COMMENTS.

##### II.3.1 Draft Section 3.1, Climate and Air Quality

A. One of the most glaring deficiencies in the draft PEIS is inadequate consideration of likely impacts to local and regional air quality. Indeed, the proposal to expand a major interstate over a nearly 144-mile stretch, significantly increasing both vehicle volume and speed on this portion of I-70, will undoubtedly increase emissions of air pollutants. But the draft PEIS provides a mere four pages of discussion on anticipated impacts. This is completely inadequate. Moreover, the document fails to address at all whether improvements to the I70 corridor will: (1) exasperate the Denver metro area's ongoing ozone problem; (2) further impact visibility in Class I areas; and (3) impact public health along the I-70 corridor as a result of exposure to toxic air pollutants known to be associated with automobile and track exhaust. Each of these are discussed separately below.

##### B. Regional Ozone.

The Denver-Boulder area's attainment status for ozone is tenuous at best. Before 1992, the region was official in non-attainment for ozone in 1992, 40 C.F.R. § 80.27(a)(2). Between 1992 and September 2001, the region has been under a maintenance plan for ozone, during which time the area consistently, but often just barely, met the 1-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ozone. See 66 Fed. Reg. 47086. Today, however, meeting the ozone standard in the region is again at risk, as there have been several violations of the 1-hour standard during the summer months since 2003. See 67 Fed. Reg. 3435 (Jan. 24, 2002). Indeed, because of the increased threat of the region once again being designated in non-attainment for the ozone standard, Colorado and the U.S. EPA have entered into an Early Action Compact to address the reduction (or at least maintenance) of sources of ozone pollution.

Under these circumstances, NEPA mandates an analysis of whether increasing both vehicle volume and speed on portions of I-70 just west of the Denver metro area may further impact the region's ozone problem. Of particular concern is whether there may be increased emissions of ozone precursors, such as NOx, as a result of the proposed I-70 corridor. A revised draft PEIS must analyze this issue, and also exam the potential for pollutant transport from the I-70 corridor into the Denver metro area.

In this regard, NEPA regulations specifically elaborate upon the responsibilities of CDOT when information is incomplete. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22. Agencies must obtain that information if it is relevant to a reasonably foreseeable significant impact, is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives, and the overall cost of obtain it are not exorbitant. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(a); Colorado Env'tl Coalition v. Dombeck, 185 F.3d 1162, 1172 (10th Cir. 2002). In this case, an analysis of potential increase in ozone levels in the Denver metro area, including a pollutant transport study, was needed to evaluate a "reasonably foreseeable" increase in air pollution and clearly is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives. See, e.g., Davis v. Mineta, 302 F.3d 1104, 1114 n.5 (10th Cir. 2002) (NEPA is intended to focus the agency's attention to environmental consequences and to provide relevant information needed for forming and implementing an agency decision); Blue Mountains, 161 F.3d at 1216 (quoting Marsh v. Oregon Natural Resources Council, 490 U.S. 360, 371 (1989)) impacts analysis under NEPA should be done up front so that an agency "will not act on incomplete information only to regret its decision after it is too late to correct."

##### C. Visibility.

The draft PEIS concludes that none of the proposed project alternatives would contribute to the deterioration of visibility in Class I areas. This conclusion is premised on the forecast that, although vehicle traffic will increase, total emissions would decrease because of stricter car emissions standards and lower sulfur content in diesel fuels. This conclusion is supported by Appendix Table A-33 in the Draft. The estimates of year 2025 reductions NOx, the major contributor to visibility degradation, and of SO2 and CO appear to be justified on the basis of modeling. There is inadequate discussion of cumulative of impacts from other sources, including those attributable to land use, that combine with automotive source pollution. History has shown us that, if anything, the automobile industry and other industries have very effectively fought off, or delayed, changes to emission standards in recent years. The standards for emission controls established in the late time frame of President Clinton's administration are not in law or regulation and are subject to change by any Federal Administration that is not supportive of high standards of clean air and health impacts from air quality.

The primary pollutants of concern must include particulate matter and carbon monoxides but also nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, and volatile organic carbon. NOx and SO2 can be transported long distances and are transformed into major components of PM. Knox and VOC combine to form ozone. Vehicle emissions are a major source of these pollutants. Rocky Mountain National Park has experienced many exceedences of the federal ozone standard in the last few years. NOx and SO2 are major components of regional haze, the visibility reducing pollution.

While Class I areas near the I-70 corridor, such as Eagles Nest Wilderness and Flattops Wilderness, have good visibility compared to all the wilderness areas in the country, they are required by federal law

and regulation to improve their visibility by almost one deciview by 2064. It is meaningless in terms of the Clean Air Act and its regional haze sections to compare these Class I areas to other ones in the country, by law they must be evaluated relative to their own natural conditions. The Western Regional Air Partnership, the regional haze regional planning organization for the western states, has the modeling capability to determine the effect of increased VMT emissions on visibility in all Class I areas in the state. Because of the regional nature of the pollutants, it is necessary to use a regional model to determine their effects. Regarding transport of pollutants, it is noted that visibility modeling for a proposed major power plant near Pueblo reveals a potential visibility degradation at Great Sand Dunes National Park, far to the west and across a major mountain range.

The Club is concerned that the PEIS fails to provide an adequate discussion of such matters to justify this conclusion in the PEIS. Methow Valley Citizens Council, 490 U.S. 332, 352 (1989) (NEPA mandates that the agency at least provide a reasonable discussion of the basis for this conclusion so that the public and decision makers can understand its basis and potential flaws.

#### D. Toxics

The draft PEIS's discussion regarding mobile source air toxics is deficient in several ways. First, the draft assumes that because the EPA has not established any current federal standards regulating mobile source air toxics, the impact need not be fully analyzed in a NEPA document. This is an obvious erroneous assumption. While NEPA in fact mandates that an agency consider whether an action may result in violation of a federal, state or local environmental standard (40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b) (10)), the analysis does not end there. To the contrary, NEPA mandates that the agency analyze and disclose all significant impacts associated with its actions. See 40 C.F.R. § 1502.16 (a) and (b). Thus, in this case there is overwhelming, mounting evidence of not only the significant amount of toxic emissions associated with vehicle use of major roads and highways, but also on its impact to human health. Thus, the State of California has even listed diesel particulates to be a known carcinogen ([http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65\\_list/files/prop65single3405.pdf](http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/files/prop65single3405.pdf)) and has otherwise concluded that it may be one of the leading causes of cancer in that state (<http://www.aqmd.gov/aqmp/docs/AirToxicsControlPlan.pdf>). Under these circumstances, a revised draft PEIS must be issued to fully analyze these risks.

Evidence and references are included here in Appendices and are hereby incorporated as part of this text.

Appendix C-1, HEALTH EFFECTS OF MOTOR VEHICLE POLLUTANTS, By Robert H. Yuhnke, February 24, 2005

Appendix C-2, NEPA's Uncertainty Principle in the Federal Legal Scheme -- Controlling Air Pollution From Motor Vehicles by Robert E. Yuhnke, Environmental Law Review April 2005, 35 ELR 10273.

Appendix C-3, Air Quality & Climate: Developments Along the I-70 Mountain Corridor

By Dr. Paulette Middleton, May 6, 2005 (Presented and Submitted to the Rural Resort Region Meeting on the Corridor Consensus, May 6, 2005)

Appendix C-4, "Pediatrics" Journal: AIR POLLUTION: CHILDREN MORE AT RISK THAN ADULTS news release on a policy statement appearing in the December issue of Pediatrics, the peer-reviewed, scientific journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), December 6, 2004.)

By Reference: "Highway Health Hazards" Sierra Club, February 2002

Appendix C-5, "Protect Us from Cancer: Why we need to do more to protect us all from cancer-causing pollution and what you can do to help." By Brett Hulsey Sierra Club, May 2005

Second, it is a major flaw alone that the Draft PEIS failed to even mention the known health risks associated with diesel exhaust. There are vague statements about health from toxics in the second paragraph of page 3.1.2.8 in this respect: "These pollutants are in the atmosphere as a result of industrialized society, but science has been providing more evidence about the risks they pose to human health. The health risks for people exposed to urban toxics at sufficiently high concentrations or durations include an increased risk of cancer or other serious health effects. These health effects can include damage to the immune system, as well as neurological, reproductive, developmental, respiratory and other human health problems." Given the discussion above, the material in the appendix of this document, and the apparently flagrant disdain for life and health manifest in the quoted paragraph, CDOT's approach to this problem is shameful.

Third, the draft PEIS's conclusion that what ever the potential impact, it is likely to be similar to the impact on "individuals, residents, businesses, and other facilities located at similar distances from roadways with similar volumes and operating characteristics" is not only absurd, but begs the very question that must be addressed under NEPA in the PEIS. The lack of standards as an excuse for failing to assess a potential impact is ridiculous: most of the environmental factors identified in the PEIS do not have standards affiliated with them. (Can visual and aesthetics have a standard of parts per million of ugliness?)

In the case of this project, there are a number of several potential receptors of schools and playgrounds that will be impacted. CDOT should identify these and allow the potentially affected public to assess and comment on this situation.

Fourth, similar to the analysis on visibility impacts, the draft PEIS assumes that EPA will regulate downward MSAT emissions. Again, however, there is no basis for this conclusion, and, even if there was it must be reasonably discussed in the document. Methow Valley Citizens Council, 490 U.S. 332, 352 (1989).

Finally, as also discussed below, given the significant risk to public health from MSAT emission, the agency was required to analyze the issue because it relevant to a reasonably foreseeable significant impact and essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(a).

#### E. DPEIS documentation

A number of sections and pages of the DPEIS are deficient because of the inadequate treatment of air quality as discussed above.

First, the discussion on Air Toxics, Page 3.1.2.8, is deficient; it presents an unsupported and unsupported conclusion on net emission reductions.

Air quality affects ecosystem, plant and animal health. Studies of air pollution and animal health are available and CDOT should take a "hard look" at these matters. The generalities of page 3.1-5 need to be (1) expanded upon and (2) considered in decision-making.

The ultimate example of a deficiency is on Page 3.1-1 to 3.1-3 of the Draft in the listing of air pollution sources in Garfield, Eagle, Summit and Clear Creek Counties, although Jefferson County does have such pollutants. It does not list or report any automotive pollution sources; one could conclude from this example that this unprofessional and unacceptable level of documentation can exist elsewhere in the Draft.

#### F. Air Conclusion

In conclusion, NEPA mandates a more precise discussion of air pollution and public health concerns. An EIS is intended to accomplish the "objective and thorough evaluation of the environmental impact of a proposed project." Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. v. Andrus, 619 F.2d 1368, 1375 (10th Cir. 1980). "If the environmental aspects of proposed actions are easily identifiable, they should be related in such detail that the consequences of the action are apparent." Id.

The Draft PEIS's broad, unspecified conclusions regarding ozone, visibility and toxic impacts are precisely the type of "general statements about 'possible' effects and 'some risk' that 'do[es] not constitute a 'hard look' absent a justification regarding why more definitive information could not be provided." Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project v. Blackwood, 161 F.3d 1208, 1213 (9th Cir. 1998).

#### II.3.11 Draft Section 3.11, Environmental Justice

A. In addressing Environmental Justice as a mandatory consideration in the process of selecting one alternative over another, or as a criterion in any screening process, following are excerpts from two relevant documents.

From "AN OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE" PUBLICATION FHWA EP-00-013, here are some excerpts relevant to this PEIS.

"There are three fundamental Environmental Justice principles:

1. To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations.
2. To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process.
3. To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority populations and low-income populations."

Title VI and environmental justice apply to all U.S. DOT programs, policies, and activities, including, but not limited to: contracting, system planning, project development, implementation, operation, monitoring, and maintenance.

At the start of the planning process, planners must determine whether Environmental Justice issues exist and use data and other information to: (1) determine benefits to and potential negative impacts on minority populations and low-income populations from proposed investments or actions; (2) quantify expected effects (total, positive and negative) and disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority populations and low-income populations; and (3) determine the appropriate course of action, whether avoidance, minimization, or mitigation. If issues are not addressed at the planning stage, they may arise during project development, or later when they could be more difficult to mitigate and delay project decisions.

Concern for environmental justice should be integrated into every transportation decision – from the first thought about a transportation plan to post-construction operations and maintenance. The U.S. DOT Order applies to all policies, programs, and other activities that are undertaken, funded, or approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), or other U.S. DOT components:

- Policy Decisions. • Systems Planning. • Metropolitan and Statewide Planning.
- Project Development and Environmental Review under NEPA. • Preliminary Design.
- Final Design Engineering. • Right-of-Way. • Construction. • Operations and Maintenance.

All reasonably foreseeable adverse social, economic, and environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations must be identified and addressed. As defined in the Appendix of the DOT Order, adverse effects include, but are not limited to:

- ☒ Bodily impairment, infirmity, illness, or death.
- ☒ Air, noise, and water pollution and soil contamination.
- ☒ Destruction or disruption of man-made or natural resources.
- ☒ Destruction or diminution of aesthetic values.
- ☒ Destruction or disruption of community cohesion or a community's economic vitality.
- ☒ Destruction or disruption of the availability of public and private facilities and services.
- ☒ Vibration.
- ☒ Adverse employment effects.
- ☒ Displacement of persons, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations.
- ☒ Increased traffic congestion, isolation, exclusion, or separation of minority or low-income individuals within a given community or from the broader community.
- ☒ The denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of, benefits of DOT programs, policies, or activities.

Discussions about populations, such as the elderly, children, or the disabled should be included when addressing Environmental Justice and Title VI. Within the framework provided by Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, the U.S. DOT Order (5610.2) addresses only minority populations and low-income populations, and does not provide for separate consideration of elderly, children, disabled, and other populations. However, concentrations of the elderly, children, disabled, and other populations protected by Title VI and related nondiscrimination statutes in a specific area or any low-income group ought to be discussed. If they are described as low-income or minority, the basis for this should be documented.

For community impact assessment, concentrations of the elderly, children, the disabled, or similar population groups (i.e., female head of household) could also experience adverse impacts as the result of an action. All impacts on sectors of the community, including minority and low-income populations as well as impacts on the community as a whole, should be routinely investigated, analyzed, mitigated, and considered during decision making, similar to investigations of impacts on minority populations and low-income populations. All NEPA processing documentation should address all impacts (to the human and natural environments), and describe any mitigating protections or benefits that would be provided by Federal or State law, or as part of the action. In particular, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.), prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs receiving Federal financial assistance while handicapped persons are protected by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794 and 49 C.F.R. Part 27.7).

The Executive Order and the accompanying Presidential Memorandum call for specific actions to be directed in NEPA-related activities. They include:

- ☒ Analyzing environmental effects, including human health, economic, and social effects on minority populations and low-income populations when such analysis is required by NEPA;
  - ☒ Ensuring that mitigation measures outlined or analyzed in EA's, EIS's, and ROD's, whenever feasible, address disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects or proposed actions on minority populations and low-income populations;
  - ☒ Providing opportunities for community input in the FHWA NEPA process, including identifying potential effects and mitigation measures in consultation with affected communities and improving accessibility to public meetings, official documents, and notices to affected communities; and
  - ☒ In reviewing other agencies' proposed actions under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, EPA must ensure that the agencies have fully analyzed environmental effects on minority communities and low-income communities, including human health, social, and economic effects.
- ☒ The FHWA will issue additional assistance on how to address environmental justice in the NEPA process in a forthcoming publication. (End of excerpt.)

From Secretary of Transportation Order Dated February 3, 1997, "SUBJECT: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACTIONS TO ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE IN MINORITY POPULATIONS AND LOW INCOME POPULATIONS", here are some excerpts relevant to this PEIS.

#### "4. POLICY.

a. It is the policy of DOT to promote the principles of environmental justice (as embodied in the Executive Order) through the incorporation of those principles in all DOT programs, policies, and activities. This will be done by fully considering environmental justice principles throughout planning and decision-making processes in the development of programs, policies, and activities, using the principles of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI), the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (URA), the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and other DOT statutes, regulations and guidance that address or affect infrastructure planning and decisionmaking, social, economic, or environmental matters; public health; and public involvement.

#### 5. INTEGRATION WITH EXISTING OPERATIONS.

b. In undertaking the integration with existing operations described in paragraph 5a, DOT shall observe the following principles:

(1) Planning and programming activities that have the potential to have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on human health or the environment shall include explicit consideration of the effects on minority populations and low-income populations. Procedures shall be established or expanded, as necessary, to provide meaningful opportunities for public involvement by members of minority populations and low-income populations during the planning and development of programs, policies, and activities (including the identification of potential effects, alternatives, and mitigation measures).

(2) Steps shall be taken to provide the public, including members of minority populations and low-income populations, access to public information concerning the human health or environmental impacts of programs, policies, and activities, including information that will address the concerns of minority and low-income populations regarding the health and environmental impacts of the proposed action.

c. Future rulemaking activities undertaken pursuant to DOT Order 2 100.5 (which governs all DOT rulemaking), and the development of any future guidance or procedures for DOT programs, policies, or activities that affect human health or the environment, shall address compliance with Executive Order 12898 and this Order, as appropriate.

d. The formulation of future DOT policy statements and proposals for legislation which may affect human health or the environment will include consideration of the provisions of Executive Order 12898 and this Order.

#### 7. PREVENTING DISPROPORTIONATELY HIGH AND ADVERSE EFFECTS

a. Under Title VI, each Federal agency is required to ensure that no person, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, is excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. This statute affects every program area in DOT. Consequently, DOT managers and staff must administer their programs in a manner to assure that no person is excluded from participating in, denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination by any program or activity of DOT because of race, color, or national origin.

b. It is DOT policy to actively administer and monitor its operations and decision making to assure that nondiscrimination is an integral part of its programs, policies, and activities. DOT currently administers policies, programs, and activities which are subject to the requirements of NEPA, Title VI, URA, ISTEA and other statutes that involve human health or environmental matters, or interrelated social and economic impacts. These requirements will be administered so as to identify, early in the development of the program, policy or activity, the risk of discrimination so that positive corrective action can be taken. In implementing these requirements, the following information should be obtained where relevant, appropriate and practical:

- population served and/or affected by race, color or national origin, and income level;
- proposed steps to guard against disproportionately high and adverse effects on persons on the basis of race, color, or national origin;
- present and proposed membership by race, color, or national origin, in any planning or advisory body which is part of the program.

c. Statutes governing DOT operations will be administered so as to identify and avoid discrimination and avoid disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority populations and low-income populations by:

- (1) identifying and evaluating environmental, public health, and interrelated social and economic effects of DOT programs, policies and activities,
- (2) proposing measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse environmental and public health effects and interrelated social and economic effects, and providing offsetting benefits and opportunities to enhance communities, neighborhoods, and individuals affected by DOT programs, policies and activities, where permitted by law and consistent with the Executive Order.



- (3) considering alternatives to proposed programs, policies, and activities, where such alternatives would result in avoiding and/or minimizing disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental impacts, consistent with the Executive Order, and
- (4) eliciting public involvement opportunities and considering the results thereof, including soliciting input from affected minority and low-income populations in considering alternatives.

#### 8. ACTIONS TO ADDRESS DISPROPORTIONATELY HIGH AND ADVERSE EFFECTS.

a. Following the guidance set forth in this Order and its Appendix, the head of each Operating Administration and the responsible officials for other DOT components shall determine whether programs, policies, and activities for which they are responsible will have an adverse impact on minority and low-income populations and whether that adverse impact will be disproportionately high.

b. In making determinations regarding disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations, mitigation and enhancements measures that will be taken and all offsetting benefits to the affected minority and low-income populations may be taken into account, as well as the design, comparative impacts, and the relevant number of similar existing system elements in non-minority and nonlow-income areas.

c. The Operating Administrators and other responsible DOT officials will ensure that any of their respective programs, policies or activities that will have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority populations or low-income populations will only be carried out if further mitigation measures or alternatives that would avoid or reduce the disproportionately high and adverse effect are not practicable. In determining whether a mitigation measure or an alternative is "practicable," the social, economic (including costs) and environmental effects of avoiding or mitigating the adverse effects will be taken into account.

d. Operating Administrators and other responsible DOT officials will also ensure that any of their respective programs, policies or activities that will have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on populations protected by Title VI ("protected populations") will only be carried out if

- (1) a substantial need for the program, policy or activity exists, based on the overall public interest; and
- (2) alternatives that would have less adverse effects on protected populations (and that still satisfy the need identified in subparagraph (1) above), either (i) would have other adverse social, economic, environmental or human health impacts that are more severe, or (ii) would involve increased costs of extraordinary magnitude.

#### APPENDIX

##### 1. DEFINITIONS The following terms where used in this Order shall have the following meanings\* :

Adverse effects means the totality of significant individual or cumulative human health or environmental effects, including interrelated social and economic effects, which may include, but are not limited to: bodily impairment, infirmity, illness or death; air, noise, and water pollution and soil contamination; destruction or disruption of man-made or natural resources; destruction or diminution of aesthetic values; destruction or disruption of community cohesion or a community's economic vitality; destruction or disruption of the availability of public and private facilities and services; vibration; adverse employment effects; displacement of persons, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations; increased traffic congestion; isolation, exclusion or separation of minority or low-income individuals within a given community or from the broader community; and the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of, benefits of DOT programs, policies, or activities.

Disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and low-income populations means an adverse effect that:

- (1) is predominately borne by a minority population and/or a low-income population, or
- (2) will be suffered by the minority population and/or low-income population and is appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that will be suffered by the non-minority population and/or non-low-income population." (End of Excerpt.)

B. Despite the interesting census data, it is evident that there are a number of fatal flaws in Section 3-13.

- (1) Certain disproportionate effects within and between counties can be identified, most assuredly when comparing the alternatives with consideration the inclusion of "totality" of adverse effects;
- (2) Age (elderly, young) people or populations have been ignored, contrary to the FHWA document excerpted above;
- (3) Health is ignored, and even though young people and elderly, for example, may not be a disproportionately high percent of a population, they suffer a disproportionately high impact and this must be considered in comparing alternatives;
- (4) Although one cannot immediately speculate on any Environmental Justice aspect of construction impacts versus long-term impacts – adverse and beneficial – in comparing alternatives, CDOT should take a hard look at this;
- (5) Economics have not been given consideration as regards the benefits and costs of alternatives, the EJ people will receive far fewer economic benefits from a car-only system than will the non-EJ population;
- (6) The PEIS speaks of interviewing people in 2002, but gives no information on the results of the interviews, and this should be disclosed and made available for comment;
- (7) There is no evidence that CDOT has a pro-active effort or outreach, now that the Draft PEIS is available for review, to bring the EJ populations into the process that affects them; post-2002 information and analysis is highly relevant;
- (8) Every guidance and requirement of the excerpted documents above do not exempt a Programmatic EIS from full consideration of EJ analysis, and inasmuch as this is, as has been noted, effectively a "Tier 1 plus Tier 2" EIS, more attention must be paid to EJ impacts and enhancements in the process of winnowing out the present alternatives and any variations on them that have been proposed since the publication of the Draft (by NWCOC Coalition etc.)

#### II.3.2 Section 3.2, Biological Resources

A. The secondary impacts of specific alternatives from induced growth need to be evaluated in terms of wildlife issues. If the long term effects of induced growth of different alternatives on wildlife habitat are considered, the PEIS does not indicate what the effect will be. In the second paragraph of "Growth and Development" page 3.2-21 the PEIS states:

"Development trends are expected to occur differently for Transit versus Highway alternatives, with more rural growth areas developing in response to highway alternatives, and urban areas developing faster with Transit alternatives."

This paragraph translates effectively into possibly greater overall habitat loss as a result of Highway alternatives as a result of rural development. Rural development further degrades wildlife habitat as a result of habitat fragmentation and the associated induced edge effects. Increased road density as a result of rural development can effectively reduce or eliminate usable habitat for some species. The opportunity for human wildlife conflicts also increases as a result of rural development, either thru animal vehicle collisions or habituation of wildlife. Rural development also increases the opportunity for the establishment of invasive exotics, both animal and plant, from landscaping or escaped pets. Invasive plant species are often very aggressive and can quickly degrade the forage value of habitat for wildlife.

The transit alternatives according to this paragraph would have less far reaching secondary effects if already established urban areas and hubs around transit stations were the focus of induced growth. The induced growth in these areas would not be as detrimental to wildlife as the rural growth, because growth would occur primarily in areas where the loss of habitat has already occurred. The resultant fragmentation and overall habitat degradation could be significantly less for the urban focused induced growth than for the rural focused induced growth that would accompany the highway alternatives.

. An elevated transit fixed guideway would obviate or avoid many of the impacts associated with highway development.

The major failure in the habitat loss equation is that the secondary impacts resulting from induced growth are never considered in the "habitat loss" for biological resources starting on page 3.2-17 and ending on 3.2-18. These secondary impact effects may be more significant than actual effects of transportation construction and associated habitat loss immediately associated with the I-70 footprint.

Construction periods would likely increase the barrier effect of the I-70 corridor as human disturbance and activity would interfere with natural behavior and movement patterns. The timing of construction along key migration corridors as well as habitat linkage zones should be scheduled to avoid interference with seasonal wildlife movements.

Section 3.2 pages 3.2-17 and 18. The discussion of the impacts on key Habitat Loss needs further clarification. Vegetation and the associated habitat recovery times in the construction disturbance zone along the corridor construction areas are not discussed along with mitigation efforts. The PEIS suggests that the original habitat along the construction disturbance zone may be very difficult to restore. By separating and representing the construction disturbance zone as an only temporary loss of habitat the PEIS is misrepresenting the true loss of habitat associated with an alternative. If the original habitat structure and functions that existed before construction are not completely restored then the reclaimed construction disturbance zone should be considered a permanent habitat loss along with the footprint and clearly be represented as such.

B. The loss of key habitat is characterized and quantified purely in acres of impacted habitat occurring within the footprint, the construction disturbance zone, and an associated sensitivity zone. These impacts are generalized for specific species and do not take into account the relative value of that habitat for the localized species populations. A loss of 10 acres of bighorn sheep severe winter range habitat in the eastern side of the corridor may be more critical to the eastern population because of a high population density relative to severe winter range habitat acreage. A loss of ten acres of bighorn severe winter range habitat in the western part of the corridor may not be as critical as a result of a lower population to habitat acreage ratio. The acreage estimates for habitat loss are meaningless unless a relative local value of impact can be associated with each alternative and the number of acres lost with that alternative.

C. The increased presence of road salts used for traction and road deicing and naturally associated with highway alternatives is not discussed in their relationship to increasing opportunities for animal vehicle collisions (AVCs). The link between road salts and AVCs is never discussed in section 3.2.2.5. Wildlife species are often attracted to high concentrations of salts along treated roadsides in the spring due to reduced salt diets throughout the winter. Because of this very natural behavior wildlife are in greater danger of non-natural mortality as a result of vehicle collisions. In evaluating the alternatives the effects of maintenance and operations activities on wildlife behavior should be considered along with other mitigation factors such as wildlife crossings.

D. For any highway improvements, wildlife crossings should be of appropriate size and scale to ensure use by target and incidental species.

E. The impact of specific alternatives on small mammal and migratory songbird populations is not evaluated in any depth in the Biological Resources of the PEIS. The evaluation of narrow habitat types (riparian and aspen forests) on page 3.2-7 and the associated loss of potential nesting sites requires an indirect and unclear examination of chart 3.2-2 to try and differentiate the predicted impact on songbirds. Loss of foraging habitat also critical for the completion of life cycles should also be considered along with increased nest predation and parasitism rates as a result of edge effect from increased habitat fragmentation. The impact of noise and the startle effect on page 3.2-21 is an important issue with regard to songbirds, but mitigation efforts such as transit timing never discussed or proposed to minimize the impact.

F. The impact of the different alternatives on small mammal populations is never discussed other than as a passing reference in the need to investigate placing median barrier with gaps every 0.25 mile to allow small mammals to pass as mitigation effort in Table 3.2-1.

### II.3.3 Section 3.3, Threatened, Endangered, and Other Special Status Animal and Plant Species

A. There is a failure to fully address the presence of the Colorado Greenback Cutthroat trout in the main stem of the Clear Creek Drainage. Section 3.3 notes the presence of a resident Clear Creek population of greenback cutthroat trout that is already in decline as a result of heavy metal contamination, the impacts on populations that use Clear Creek seasonally as a migration corridor are not addressed. The Colorado Greenback Cutthroat Trout is primarily found in adjacent streams that drain into Clear Creek; most of these streams are dry in winter and are not suitable winter refugia. It is likely that the Colorado Greenback Cutthroat Trout uses the Clear Creek in winter months and the effects of all alternatives should be considered with relevance to their impact on this species. Page 3.3-17 states "the effects of road construction would depend on the particular requirements of each construction project for portions of the Corridor and will be considered in the Tier 2 studies. There seems to be a lack of consistency if the Colorado Department of Transportation is taking possibly aggressive steps to narrow the potential habitat of the Colorado Greenback Cutthroat Trout while the Colorado Division of Wildlife is currently conducting reintroduction efforts. The reintroduction efforts are as an alternative to a formal section 7/ Section 10 consultation process. Such reintroduction efforts should effectively define the Colorado Greenback Cutthroat trout as a species having special status as an endangered species, though not officially listed. The presence of endangered species must be considered in the decision process and selection of a preferred alternative. FHWA should immediately initiate a consultation process with the USFWS on the Colorado Greenback Cutthroat trout. Resultant Biological Analyses or Biological Opinions would identify the probable impacts of the separate alternatives to these species populations and help determine the highway alternative that would be least detrimental. Such evaluation is inappropriate at a tier 2 level as a highway alternative will already have been chosen.

B. The PEIS does not adequately address the substantial effect of direct highway mortality on the Southern Rockies Canada Lynx population. The PEIS indicates in section 3.3 page 3.3-5 that a total of 3 lynx have died as a result of vehicle collisions on I-70. I-70 is a significant distance from the core lynx area and the density of Lynx in this area should be extremely low. Road killed Lynx account for approximately 11.5% of the Lynx mortalities since the 1999 re-introduction and I-70 accounts for nearly 43% of those road kills, even though it is a significant distance from any real lynx population. I-70 poses a significant mortality risk to lynx that access the habitat around it. Because the Lynx population is still considered threatened and has only just started to show evidence of breeding it is still vulnerable to extirpation. There is a high likelihood of increased lynx mortalities as the re-introduced population moves out of the core lynx area of the San Juan Mountains and into the good Lynx habitat in the White River National Forest around the I-70 corridor. It is imperative that the recommendations of the ALIVE committee with respect to maintaining habitat linkages and creating appropriate wildlife crossings be implemented.

### II.3.4 Section 3.4, Water Resources

A. The Tier 1 Draft PEIS was developed in order to meet the information and data needs for a "Tier 1" NEPA guidance instead of a more detailed Tier 2 assessment which would examine according to the transportation alternative selected, impacts of issues, measurement of potential impact and a degree of mitigation of adverse impacts. The rules for sufficient Tier 1 analysis requirements are largely vague and without any know formal guidance. That these requirements allow the exclusion until Tier-2 of necessary studies is a major deficiency of the decision process of this draft PEIS. By delaying examination of these impacts until Tier 2 the EIS does not allow consideration of critical details necessary for effective alternative evaluation and selection until later assessments. There are several specific examples of this deficiency that indicate delay of a detailed analysis of critical components to a Tier 2 study: 1) in the last sentence of section 3.4.2.1 discussing methods and coordination, 2) in the last sentence of the text of Section 3.4.1.2, and 2) during the discussion of eutrophication in section 3.4.2.1 page 5.

B. The identification of the short term construction related impacts as they differ from long term maintenance and operational impacts for the highway. Separating the two would allow for a more balanced perspective. This would have been especially useful in section 3.4.3 which addresses water related environmental consequences of both the direct and indirect impacts of alternatives and issues noted in the PEIS. More detailed information of the potential negative impacts and mitigation plans should have been included in the selection and assessment of alternatives.

C. In Section 3.5.2.1, Direct Impacts, statements are made that the impacts resulting from the degradation of water quality, disturbance of habitat and trout spawning areas are limited to "immediately downstream from construction activities" and "Acres of disturbance in a 200-foot sensitivity area". The very nature of high gradient streams and their ability transport sediment means that these impacts will affect the streams far beyond these limited zones of consideration. As an example, the high quality fishery of the Blue River is seriously degraded by current activities as far downstream as Green Mountain Reservoir. Traction sand is also moving out of Black Gore Creek into Gore Creek and the Eagle River, a situation that the proposed mitigation by application of the SCAP is inadequately dealt with.

D. Section 3.4, Water Resources, page 3.4-26, states that 12, 536 linear feet of stream will be impacted by the footprint of the highway. The PEIS maintains that this represents less of an impact than transit alternatives particularly rail based alternatives. This impact determination is not supportable in that it represents the inside dimensions of the footprint and only represents the disturbance of a completed facility. This estimate does not include the probable impacts as a result of cut and fill requirements at the edges of the footprint nor does it appear to include the effects of construction. The EIS should be corrected to identify the true impact of the footprint on streams.

E. Appendix A describes the technical methodology for the water resource (as well as other environmental issues) analysis and data. The problem is whether or not these were quantitative or semi-quantitative analysis used in threshold determination for measuring the degree of impact.

☐ How much traction material (sand and deicer) is necessary to reach a level to be considered detrimental?

☐ The inclusion within the assessment of a quantitative estimate (not just the qualitative effects) of the effects of increased mineralization as a result of new road cuts and disturbance of mine tailings.

☐ As above, a quantitative assessment of highway-related sediment and storm-water runoff controls (only a qualitative assessment is given) through the use of proposed Best Management Practices during not only construction but also during post construction operation and maintenance activities.

F. How are factors weighted in the environmental sensitivity calculation (Appendix A) for comparison and evaluation of alternatives? Highly critical environmental components judged as "intermediate impact" should be weighted and considered more heavily than low importance or critical value environmental components receiving "greatest impact" designation. A ranking process for the numerous components should be made in the evaluation process of the PEIS.

G. The disturbance of historic mine waste materials due to construction activities of the project alternatives may cause the release of contaminants and heavy metals into streams thereby inhibiting water quality. This topic of direct impact is identified in section 3.4 page 3.4-1 and section 3.8 page 3.8-1 of the PEIS. In the same vein, historic mill sites and the associated operations of mining are another potentially significant source of heavy metal contamination of waters. The eastern side of the corridor especially in Clear Creek County has a significant mining history and this is noted in section

3.8.2.6. The PEIS indicates that though an inventory that characterizes the history of mining in the I-70 corridor, the mineralized belt transecting the highway, and the use of mine waste as road fill has been done, it is far from complete and more detail will be reached in tier 2 studies. It is reasonable to assume that for all the proposed alternatives being considered (except no action) mine wastes will be disturbed as a result of construction activities, new road cuts will expose mineralized rock and mine waste may be used as fill for the highway. The PEIS does not provide any way to rank the alternatives according to these detrimental impacts. The crucial statement that shows this is the statement on page 3.8-6 of the PEIS that states, "Note that the direct impacts have not been quantified during Tier 1 studies." This delay of critical evaluation of impacts does not allow an effective evaluation of the pros and cons of individual alternatives regarding water quality.

H. The estimate of sediment recapture as a result of mitigation efforts associated with each alternative needs to be addressed. In this same line of thought, the probable fate of chemical deicer and sediment transport into streams needs to be addressed.

I. An evaluation of mitigation policies to be associated with each alternative that would be executed by the FHWA or CDOT is deferred until Tier-2 studies (See section 3.19.2 page 3.19-2). The consideration of alternatives and the ultimate selection of a preferred alternative could be affected to a large degree by the mitigation measures necessary for alternative implementation and the associated costs. By delaying until Tier 2 the analysis of the impacts specifically associated with each alternative and the necessary mitigation, along with the costs of mitigation, the result is key factors are not being considered in the overall policy stance.

J. Stormwater discharges are significant contributors to water quality degradation, with local governments under the Clean Water Act shouldering most of the public costs for addressing stormwater pollution, including costs and loadings attributable to highways on the federal aid system. For obvious reasons, state transportation departments and road advocates like the status quo, since local taxpayers through property taxes and sewer and water rates are actually bearing the costs of cleaning up the pollution from federally-designated transportation networks, rather than highway users. Additional discussion of this in terms of land use impacts and water quality is in order in the Draft PEIS.

K. At the most recent 2005 Water Quality Control Commission hearing, there was a progress report on the Clear Creek watershed process in which parties from Standley Lake to the headwaters of Clear Creek were supposed to be working together to deal with the nutrient pollution that threatens to turn Standley Lake into an algae-filled cess-pool. The "progress report" concluded that there had been essentially no progress over the ten years or so the collaborative program had been in effect, principally because small towns in the headwaters of the basin were too poor to fund proper sewage treatment. We are not sure what effect an expanded highway would have on this problem, but we suspect that it will not make it better. It is likely to add even more pollutants from the highway. These out-of-corridor potential impacts, and any similar impact, warrant a "hard look."

#### II.4 CHAPTER 4. Cumulative Impacts Analysis

II.4.1 NEPA defines a cumulative impact as "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time." 40 CFR § 1508.27(b)(7). An EIS must analyze the combined effects of proposed actions in sufficient detail to allow informed decisions to be made on the level of cumulative impacts and the need for avoiding or mitigating such impacts. See e.g., Grand Canyon Trust v. Federal Aviation Admin., 290 F.3d 339 (D.C. Cir. 2002).

"Courts have recognized that the indirect effects of a proposed action may, in fact, have a more significant effect on the environment than the direct effects." (Murray Feldman Esq., Holland and Hart, Continuing legal Education conference on NEPA, Broomfield, CO, February 3-4, 2005)

II.4.2 The Chapter 4 on Cumulative Impacts poses a difficult challenge for the reviewer for several reasons.

A. Every element that has incorrect or deficient information as discussed by reviewers/commenters of the Draft feeds into cumulative analysis. Hence, any conclusion in Chapter 4 that draws upon information from Chapter 3 may be erroneous or deficient. Air quality, Environmental Justice, visual matters, energy, and so forth are all in this category.

B. Section 4.1 "Regulatory Guidance" references two essential documents for cumulative impact analysis, but fails to use the guidance, principles and methodologies expounded in those references.

C. Cumulative impacts analysis is essentially an integrative process and the best methods are those that are based upon principles of ecology. Scientists have developed extensive knowledge of the study of organisms and their environment. The CEQ guide referenced in Chapter 4 has methodologies that should be utilized in this respect. The analyses in Chapter 4 are by the individual elements of Chapter 3: air quality, water resources, Visual, etc. The approaches taken are semi-integrative at best. One further step is need to cross-integrate impacts. To illustrate this, 4.4.4 Social and Economic Values, does not include or integrate noise, recreation, environmental justice, the intangible values of history and history-visual perception discuss hereinabove ("Visual Resources"). Its Historic Impacts are limited to access lost, not on the socio-economic and civic values or the "constructive impacts" as required by law and regulation. What do losses of historic values meant to Front Range and Colorado residents and tourists? What do water-related ecological impacts mean to recreation and social values of residents and visitor? CDOT does not choose to investigate these impacts.

The deficiencies of 4.4.4 are repeated in other parts of the cumulative impacts analysis.

D. A map of "Impact Zones" in Clear Creek County, Appendix D hereto, shows an example of areas where a number of impacts occur: air, noise, Visual, land values, and perhaps others. This map is consistent with methods described in the CEQ Guidelines on cumulative analysis. CDOT should utilize this approach in taking Chapter 4, which is sadly deficient as it is, to the next step.

E. The Federal approach to ecological analysis is expounded in the following. The CEQ Guidelines on Cumulative effects have several appendices that explain methodologies for utilization of ecosystem analysis. When an EIS addresses non-urban regions, it is remiss if it fails to uses such approaches. Given the vast non-urbanized area involved and the complexity of ecosystems and needs for protection of ecological quality, the DPEIS is inadequate in considerations of ecology versus elements of ecology. Even though the following is not mandatory for field operations, it is a display of intent and the desirability of application of ecological processes in projects. It is found in the "FHWA Environmental Guidebook."

Categorized Comment	430	Sierra Club	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/16/2005	<p>Sierra Club Rocky Mountain Chapter 1536 Wynkoop Street Suite 4c Denver, CO 80202 Phone 303-861-8819 Fax 303-861-2436 www.rmcs.sierraclub.org</p> <p>February 16, 2005</p> <p>Mr. Tom Norton Executive Director Colorado Department of Transportation 4201 East Arkansas Avenue Denver CO 80222</p> <p>Dear Mr. Norton,</p> <p>Rocky Mountain Chapter, Sierra Club, Position Statement on I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS</p> <p>The Executive Committee of the Rocky Mountain Chapter, Sierra Club, has adopted (February 10, 2005) a formal position regarding the Alternatives under consideration in the PEIS as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the Preferred Alternative: we adopt the position of the current consensus in the Corridor: Fixed Guideway Transit System, using a rail technology and not bus fixed guideway No six-lane highway improvements; utilize selected highway improvements only Enhanced Bus Operations to supplement Fixed Guideway Transit System Intermodal Transfer Centers Travel Demand Management Travel System Management Enhanced Air Service Consider Alternate Routes outside of the Highway Right-of-way as appropriate.</li> <li>Regarding the non-CDOT Train Alternative: we encourage and support the development of a planning study to examine the feasibility such alternative.</li> <li>We urge CDOT to utilize environmental criteria in the final screening and analysis instead of only capital cost. Full environmental costs must be included. If, in the Hearings or during the Comment period, there are any public comments regarding the inadequacy of environmental findings, the Final PEIS should not be issued until the public has a chance to review the reactions and further re-studies of such concerns.</li> </ol> <p>The PEIS process has not identified a "vision" of what the mountains will be for future generations. How much mountain sprawl do we want? How much pavement do we want? How many parking lots do we want? These issues need to be resolved before any irreversible highway construction is approved, and these cannot be deferred to Tier II studies.</p> <p>Sincerely</p>	Written
---------------------	-----	-------------	--	-----------	---	---------

Albert G. Melcher  
Transportation Committee Chair Emeritus Rocky Mountain Chapter Sierra Club

Rocky Mountain Chapter  
1536 Wynkoop Street Suite 4c Denver, CO 80202  
Phone 303-861-8819 Fax 303-861-2436 www.rmc.sierraclub.org

February 16, 2005

Mr. Tom Norton  
Executive Director  
Colorado Department of Transportation  
4201 East Arkansas Avenue  
Denver CO 80222

Dear Mr. Norton,

Re: I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS

Some members of the Rocky Mountain Chapter, Sierra Club ask that their opinions be included in the record as to their agreement with the position "I oppose widening I-70 W. because it will pollute the environment and air, destroy families, ruin the mountain landscape, harm wetlands & threaten our water. Please make safety improvements and dedicated rail & bus lanes."

Linda Warner  
1939 12th Avenue  
Greeley, Co 80631

Brian Murphy  
2638 Williams Street  
Denver, CO 80205 USA

Jen White  
17301 Rimrock Dr  
Golden, CO 80401

Candice & Tim Johnson  
2290 Locust St.  
Denver 80207

David Bahr  
95 Meadowland Ct.  
Nederland CO 80466

Amber Keare  
216 N. Commonwealth Av.  
Elgin, IL 60123

Billy L Funk 6671  
South Cherokee St.  
Littleton, CO 80120

Linda Batlin  
680 Tantra Dr.  
Boulder, CO 80305

Nancy Urban Ingalls  
13663 N. Winchester Way  
Parker, CO 80138

William G. Sikes, Jr. and  
Jane W. Sikes  
23957 Deer Valley Road  
Golden, CO 80401

Courtney James  
8795 S. Brentwood St.  
Littleton, CO 80128

JoLynn Jarboe  
3204 S Dahlia St  
Denver, CO 80222

Steve Welter  
1055 Waite Drive  
Boulder, CO 80303

Bill and Mary Dukes  
928 Milwaukee Street  
Denver, CO 80206

Sincerely,

Albert G. Melcher  
Transportation Committee Chair Emeritus Rocky Mountain Chapter Sierra Club

Categorized Comment	331	Mellon, Stephanie	Public	2/9/2005	<p>My husband and I are a young family living in Clear Creek County. We bought our house just a year and half ago with the hopes of raising our children ages 2 &amp; 5 in Lawson. If you widen the highway, you are stealing our quality of life in many ways.</p> <p>1. The highway will be in our front yard and our friends and neighbors homes will be gone.</p> <p>2. I am a waitress and my husband a bartender in Idaho Springs at the Buffalo Bar. We look forward to the highway backing up to the extent that it pays our bills. The more traffic, the more business construction will damage the tourism business in our county for the next 20 years. Try putting a traffic light in Dumont by Conoco. It will help the frontage road traffic (an alternative). Straighten the "S" curves by Fall River so there is less back up and less accidents. Prepare the roads and add plow trucks in bad weather. Less car accidents will keep traffic moving. Let's start with the small problems before you take on a project that has no financial backing. Tourism runs our state and you will kill it if you don't listen and then act.</p> <p>P.S. Moneymaker Disney would have already put in a monorail. It adds to the appeal of skiing in the mountains, which is our economic future.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	510	Mesec, Patricia	Public	5/18/2005	<p>Although I was unable to attend any of the public hearings regarding the I70 corridor, I am very interested in it. I would hope that you do everything possible to maintain and enhance the beauty of our beautiful corridor. I would hope that your ultimate goal would be to provide a balanced transportation system which includes more than just additional lanes for automobiles and trucks. People will use public transportation if it is good, i.e. clean, fast, efficient, and affordable. Trains and monorails are very popular in other parts of the world, and gas will get ever more expensive.</p> <p>In places where it is appropriate, could an alternate route be used? US 40 parallels I70 through Mt. Vernon canyon and might provide the opportunity for reversible lanes at certain high traffic times. During most of the hours of any one week of the year, the traffic is very manageable. It seems a shame to destroy a wonderful corridor for those few hours when traffic is a big problem.</p> <p>Patricia F. Mesec</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	249	Meyer, Paul A. and Linda K.	Public	2/24/2005	<p>February 24, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager CDOT, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>SUBJECT: I-70 DRAFT PEIS</p> <p>As twenty year residents of Clear Creek County and life time Coloradans, we want to pass onto you our support of the Six-Lane Highway 85 mph Alternative. We would also encourage you to not be intimidated by the I-70 Central Mountain Transportation Coalition These people have fought any change or suggested improvement to I-70 for at least 25 years. Let's move ahead on the I-70 improvements for all highway users and not get bogged down by special interest groups.</p>	Written

Respectfully,

Paul A. and Linda K. Meyer  
37895 Highway 40  
Evergreen, CO 80439

Categorized Comment	135	Meyertons, Ralph	Public	1/12/2005	<p>My name is Ralph Meyertons. I'm going to ask that you be bold and scrap the tunnels. We can save a lot of money. I want you to build a notch through that mountain. I think you'll find that that is a longer than 15-to 50- to 100-year solution, that you can have a 20- to 30-lane highway through that.</p> <p>I almost got burned up this last summer. I was waiting outside of the Eisenhower Tunnel along with a whole bunch of other people, and an RV burned up. Now, I think we're all familiar with fires in the tunnels in Europe. That could have been me, and I wouldn't have been here to speak to you today if I had been in that tunnel halfway. That RV was only 100 yards ahead of me, and it took half an hour for it to burn down. So I'm saying, scrap the tunnels, build a notch, use the kind of procedures that they use down in Cripple Creek, and underground at Henderson or lower Copper Mine in the West and save a lot of money to boot.</p> <p>Secondly, take a look at Central City Parkway. It was a virgin road. It cost a heck of a lot less to build per mile. Nobody said it could be done for 31 million. The last price I saw, they did it for 38 million, but they didn't have to accommodate traffic along that road while they were building it.</p> <p>And I think there's a lot of room in these mountains to build a road parallel to I-70 and be a virgin road and cost a lot less money. And let the experts study how much less.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	438	Meyertons, Ralph	Public	1/12/2005	<p>1. Be Bold! Think New! Face Down the Negative Thinkers!</p> <p>2. Extend Co. Road 314 from Hidden Valley to US 6, passing under I-70 overpass, on south side of Clear Creek. Repair CR 314; Idaho Springs to Hidden Valley. Create a frontage road from Georgetown to US 6 and relieve congestion much sooner than waiting for a new major construction. The existing bike path is never used - it is a SOP to the angry activists.</p> <p>3. New: Cut a notch in the Continental Divide south of the Eisenhower Tunnels, down to tunnel level; wide enough to create benches on either side to remove snow/avalanche protection. Abandon the tunnels. Save money on operating costs. Use open-pit mining people - they can move rock cheap and even sell the surplus at a profit (e.g., Henderson Mine, Albert Frei Quarry, Cripple Creek Gold Mine).</p> <p>4. Build a new road on the mountainside above the towns in Clear Creek County, more or less parallel to the high voltage power line. Eliminate the cost to keep traffic moving on I-70 - look at the new Central City Parkway - it was built for a "can't be done" price because there was no existing traffic.</p> <p>5. Consider the same from the tunnels west.</p> <p>6. Forget rail, guideway, etc.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	455	Middleton, Lynn	Public	4/27/2005	<p>I have been driving the I70 corridor for 30 years and I am against adding more lanes. The first thing that needs to be done is to get the speed of trucks and cars under control. I just drove down the mountain today and strictly adhered to all the speed limits. I was passed by everyone except for one car. Speed limits for trucks should be 50-55 and strictly enforced!!!! Big fines for those that speed!! If more lanes are added something would have to be done to curtail the noise from all the trucks on the highway. It's already out of control. I travel a great deal, so have not been able to attend any of the meetings, but certainly appreciate those who have spoken against adding more lanes which will equate to more noise and more pollution.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	684	Middleton, Paulette	Public	5/21/2005	<p><a href="http://PanoramaPathways.net">http://PanoramaPathways.net</a> 2385 Panorama Ave. Boulder, CO USA 1-303-442-6866</p> <p>May 21, 2005</p> <p>Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>I am submitting the enclosed comments for inclusion on the administrative record for the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement 7 Section 4(f) Evaluation, December 2004. I am submitting these comments as a private citizen concerned about these developments and the proper assessment of adverse air quality and climate impacts associated with the developments.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Paulette Middleton</p> <p>Air Quality &amp; Climate: Developments Along the I-70 Mountain Corridor</p> <p>Paulette Middleton May 6, 2005</p> <p>Summary Evaluation - Draft PEIS Air Quality and Climate Assessment</p> <p>The I70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Air Quality and Climate Assessment discounted important pollutants, sources and their interactions. As a result the PEIS under-estimates the air quality and climate impacts related to the proposed developments along the Corridor.</p> <p>Adverse impacts on human health, visibility and ecology along the Corridor are the result of multiple chemical emissions, production of other harmful pollutants, transport of chemicals from beyond the Corridor, and meteorological conditions. Air quality and climate conditions along the Corridor are impacted by activities beyond the Corridor and activities along the Corridor affect conditions beyond the Corridor.</p> <p>The Intermountain West air quality, impact and development trends underscore the need to carefully and completely examine major proposed developments along the Corridor in the context of these regional trends and projections.</p> <p>Residents along the Corridor, mountain visitors and frequent commuters all are directly affected by air quality changes associated with proposed developments. Everyone eventually will be affected, in some way, by long-term climate change associated with continued and increased use of fossil fuels along the Corridor and elsewhere in the world.</p> <p>Transportation alternatives, including those that have been omitted from further consideration based on current limited economic analysis, all need to be re-assessed and compared. The realistic, more comprehensive, scope of air quality and climate must be more carefully assessed before making final decisions about the Corridor.</p> <p>Current PEIS Air Quality and Climate Assessment of Alternatives</p> <p>The PEIS considers only a very limited subset of important pollutants, impacts and sources. A much broader set must be taken into account in a proper air quality and climate assessment. The PEIS currently considers only the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pollutants       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</li> <li>Particulate Matter (PM10)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Impacts       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health related to CO and PM 10</li> <li>Visibility at Class I areas only</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Sources       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation related to I70 development alternatives only</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>By considering only emissions related to the proposed transportation alternatives and further limiting these considerations to only CO and PM10 emissions, the PEIS underestimates the air quality and</p>	Written

climate impacts related to the proposed developments along the Corridor.

Air Quality and Climate Assessment – What Must Be Considered

Graphic: Air Quality & Climate Concerns along the Corridor are Complex.  
Caption: Multiple Chemicals from Multiple Sources + Complex Chemistry & Transport = Many Short-term & Cumulative Impacts occurring Near-by and Far-away from Sources

Air quality impacts on human health, ecology and visibility are associated with a full suite of important chemical emissions and their chemical products. These emitted chemicals come from many important sources throughout the region, all of which must be taken into account in the assessment. As illustrated below, air quality impacts associated with CO and PM10 are only a small part of the overall assessment that needs to be done.

Graphic: Major Sources, Chemicals, Impacts & Their Interconnections  
Caption: An adequate air quality & climate assessment needs to address these key elements and interactions. It must take into account changes in all key sources and impacts throughout the region over the next 50 years.

Important impacts (i.e., human health, ecological well-being, visibility, contribution to climate change) are the result of many chemicals emitted from a variety of sources. Fossil fuel combustion associated with transportation, power plants, industry and other applications result in CO and PM10 plus carbon dioxide (CO2), nitrogen oxides (NOX), hundreds of volatile organic compounds (VOC) many of which are toxic (e.g., benzene), sulfur dioxide (SO2), fine particulates (PM2.5), and toxic metals (e.g., mercury Hg) along with other noxious chemicals. Some important chemicals (i.e., VOC and ammonia – NH3) along with PM10 are emitted from other activities not directly related to fossil fuel combustion. All of these important emission sources change as a result of changes in human activity, technology, and other factors associated with behavior and development choices. The cumulative contributions from multiple sources are important considerations in assessing environmental impacts in the years to come.

The environmental impacts assessment is further complicated by the fact that many directly emitted chemicals (i.e., NOX, VOC, SO2 NH3) also chemically interact to produce other chemicals (i.e., ozone, PM2.5, acids and other nitrogen chemicals) that are known to harm human health, produce haze, cause ecological damage, and contribute to climate change. Adverse haze and health impacts in an area, like the Corridor, are the result of near-by emissions combined with emissions throughout the region because of the chemical transformation and transport processes that are occurring. Similarly, emissions in the vicinity of the Corridor contribute to health and haze impacts near the Corridor and further away.

Emissions of CO2 from activities along the Corridor join with emissions from other activities throughout the region to add to the CO2 levels that, in turn, contribute to climate change. Emissions of PM2.5 along with PM2.5 formed in the air from other noxious chemicals contribute to regional climate change, as these small particles interact with incoming solar radiation to produce haze and, eventually, alter temperature patterns regionally.

In addition to these considerations regarding health, haze and climate, many human and ecological health impacts are the result of long-term as well as short-term exposure to pollutants. As a result, air quality and climate impact assessments must consider long term accumulation of pollutants and the resulting adverse impacts locally as well as on larger scales.

Air Quality Trends Underscore the Need for Thorough Assessment

The Intermountain West air quality, impact and development trends underscore the need to carefully and completely examine major proposed developments along the Corridor in the context of these trends.

The air quality trends illustrated here are discussed in detail by the National Parks Service in their report -- Air Quality Trends in National Parks <http://www2.nature.nps.gov/air/>.

Ozone is increasing throughout the region. As already noted, ozone is produced from emissions of NOX and VOC which are pollutant by-products of fossil fuel combustion, with transportation and coal-fired power plants being major sources in the Intermountain West. Ozone has adverse impacts on human health and ecosystem well-being. Ozone levels in Rocky Mountain National Park and in Denver are already a documented threat to human health and ozone impacts on ecosystems in the Colorado Rocky Mountain area also have been found.

Graphic: 10-Year Trend: Ozone Increasing Throughout Intermountain West  
Caption: Ozone harms people and ecosystems. Denver and RMNP are already known problem areas.

Haze also is problem in the Intermountain West as illustrated by these scenes from Rocky Mountain National Park.

Graphic: Near-by Example of Haze  
Rocky Mountain National Park  
(Pictures Here)  
More examples available at <http://vista.cira.colostate.edu/views/Web/General/Data.htm>

Caption: RMNP has over 3 million visitors per year...Average Visual Range a 49 Miles...a hazy day

Trend analysis indicates that haze is getting worse throughout the Intermountain West. Haze is caused by PM2.5, with particles in the 0.1-1.0 micron range being the most effective at causing haze. PM2.5 in the 0.1-1.0 micron range also is responsible for adverse health effects. As a result, worsening haze is a good indicator for increasing threats to human health. PM2.5 are being monitored in urban areas and the levels and trends in the urban, like the rural areas represented in the NPS trend analyses, are a growing concern. In fact, EPA currently is re-assessing the national standards for PM2.5 based on recent health assessments and has proposed more stringent standards.

Graphic: 10-Year Trend Increasing Haze – Decreasing Visual Range  
Trends in Deciview on Hazeiest Days, 1994-2003  
Caption: PM2.5 causes haze and adversely impacts health. Health impacts associated with PM2.5 also are increasing. National PM2.5 standards are being strengthened based on health studies documenting the dangers at lower levels.

Excess Nitrogen. Eventually, NOX, NH3, nitrogen particles formed from NOX and NH3, and other nitrogen chemicals produced from NOX and NH3 are deposited through wet and dry deposition processes. These nitrogen chemicals increase levels of nitrogen that can be taken up by ecosystems, leading to harmful imbalances in the ecosystems. Both NOX and NH3 related chemicals are increasing throughout the Intermountain West as indicated by the trends below. In addition, ecosystem damages associated with excess nitrogen already have been documented for the many areas in the Intermountain West, including some in the vicinity of the Corridor.

Graphic: 10-Year Trends: Nitrate Increasing Throughout Intermountain West  
Caption: Increasing nitrate in precipitation means increasing nitrate deposition. Excess nitrogen adversely effects ecosystems. These impacts are already being documented in the intermountain west, particularly in Colorado mountain areas.

Graphic: 10-Year Trends: Ammonium Increasing in Intermountain West  
Caption: Ammonium also contributes to excess nitrogen which is harmful to ecosystems.

Sensitive Populations Along the Corridor

Many areas in the vicinity of the Corridor are already known to be highly sensitive to the excess nitrogen, acids and ozone.

Graphic: Sensitive Ecosystem Areas Along the Corridor  
<http://www.epa.gov/airmarkets/cmapi/index.html>

The ecosystems along the Corridor are not the only populations at risk. Recent studies indicate that people living in the vicinities of major roadways are at higher risk for various forms of cancer. As noted in the figure below, many people are living along the Corridor. In addition, many travel the Corridor regularly.

Graphic: Human Health Sensitive Areas Along the Corridor  
Caption: Health studies indicate that cancer risks are much higher for those residing near major roadways

Future Developments

Many proposed developments throughout the Intermountain West will contribute to the decline in air quality throughout the region. The proposed new coal fired power plants shown below are one.

Graphic: Example of Future Developments that Impact the Corridor Air Quality  
Caption: Increases in use of fossil fuels to generate electricity & to fuel transportation all add to Air Pollution & Climate Concerns

Increased oil and gas drilling are another. Increased petroleum-based transportation is another, and one that is central to the PEIS.

All of these and related developments that change the emission patterns and levels throughout the

Corridor and region need to be taken into account as a whole. One cannot be assessed independently from others. The chemical interactions and know impacts associated with the chemical products resulting from the complex mix of emissions cannot be discounted in these important assessments of developments of the scale of those being discussed for the Corridor.

#### Expanding the Assessment – General Recommendations

To achieve the more realistic and necessary air quality and climate assessment, the scope of pollutants, impacts and sources needed to be expanded. In summary, the assessment needs to include the following:

#### Primary Pollutants

- CO, PM 10, PM2.5, Ozone, NOX, VOC, SO2, CO2 NH3

#### Impacts of Concern

- Human Health related to CO, PM2.5, Ozone, VOC toxics mainly in the Corridor And in the region as a whole  
 - Visibility associated with PM2.5 & PM10 throughout Region  
 - Ecological Damage to Sensitive Areas in the vicinity of the Corridor And in the region as a whole  
 - Potential Contribution of Corridor developments to Climate Change pollutants

#### Sources to Consider

- All Transportation Alternatives, including the ones omitted from the PEIS  
 - Other key sources (e.g., power plants, local developments, etc) throughout region

#### Analysis Technique

- Consider all key emission sources and their projected changes  
 - Compare current and future impacts of concern resulting from different transportation options in the context of other developments  
 - Take into account chemical transport, transformation and deposition processes when estimating impacts resulting from different transportation options

#### Related Analysis

- Expand the economic analysis to compare the environmental benefits achieved by alternatives that produce lower adverse impacts on health, visibility and ecology.

The air quality & climate impact differences among the alternatives must be adequately assessed and reviewed before making final decisions about the Corridor.

Categorized Comment	383	Mhm, Cory	Public	2/23/2005	<p>My name is Cory Mhm with the Breckenrige Ski Resort Chamber, and I'm also a resident of Summit County.</p> <p>And I think if there were unlimited time and unlimited money, there may be another preferred option, but we don't have either. So with that in mind and the growth pressures that were mentioned earlier about I-70 with interstate commerce traffic, resident traffic, which includes both the Front Range traffic coming up to the mountains and vice versa, as well as visitor trips, all three of these areas are growing, and growing significantly.</p> <p>In the name of the future health of the Breckenridge business community, which is about 650 businesses with about 7,500 employees -- our business community is primarily tourism-dependent, and our visitors tend to bring a lot of gear with them. Therefore, it's important that they can have their vehicles if they so desire. The reality is that I-70 is our main artery for business. And, therefore, I support the six lanes while preserving space for future transit options.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	470	Millard, Mary	Public	4/30/2005	<p>I believe the only way to proceed to actually improve the traffic situation on I-70 west of Denver is to build a high speed elevated transit. I would be in favor of the cost to build this transit. I do NOT want to disrupt traffic for 15 years while constructing a highway that will be immediately as congested when completed as things are now.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	323	Miller, Charlie	Public	2/12/2005	<p>Charlie Miller. I was liaison engineer/officer on the construction work --I was with the Forest Service, and on the construction work of I-70 over Vail Pass and also the preconstruction work in Glenwood Canyon, the conceptual design of it.</p> <p>But I -- I only have two items real quick. One was I was very pleased to hear that an old Colorado School of Mines professor and, of course, I was a graduate from there -- but anyway, for him to come up with something -- this is what I've been looking for because we are -- we looked at all these alternatives and all of them are somewhat the same. They are just -- they come up with the same solution, increase the size of the highway.</p> <p>And the question is to move people. It's not to move traffic, move vehicles. And when we come up with monorails -- we have a railroad -- as I crossed over the bridge to come here today, I could see that, why not put buses on these various trains? We have trains running through Glenwood all the time. And they could get off this point A, point B, whatever. I think we need a new -- some new ideas, maybe even tram to get over here. I don't know. But there is ways and means of doing this. And all we seem to be able to think of is traffic, how can we move vehicles.</p> <p>You know, pretty soon, it is going to be to the point where we don't have gasoline to get here. And right now, grandpa, he's got to go to a lodge meeting tonight and he jumps in his big SUV and he tools down the interstate using up lots of gas while grandma goes to the grocery store up the other direction using that big old SUV again. Pretty soon that gasoline is not going to be there anymore. We all know that. So we need innovations, some innovative thinking. And I don't see that in this group here of ideas.</p> <p>The second point I wanted to make is that somewhere along the line, I would like to see CDOT design in a bike trail. Some day there's going to be a bike trail from the Kansas border to the Utah border. We took care of that over Vail Pass, and we took care of it in Glenwood Canyon. Now, we put in that part of it.</p> <p>CDOT has lots of space out there. They've been given rights of way. Let's add that to the -- many of you have been in Europe. You know what bicycles mean over there. That's a big means of transportation, in spite of the Autobahns. Sure, you have Porches running down the Autobahns at 120 miles per hour and things like that, and you have a lot of traffic on the Autobahns.</p> <p>But it is from point A to point B. And once you get to point B, then they have either buses or you rent a bicycle and away you go. And so I think that CDOT would be real well advised to consider this in their overall plan. That's all.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	86	Miller, Edward	Public	1/26/2005	<p>Gentlemen: I attended the I-70 Corridor meeting held in Grand Junction on Jan 19,2005 at the Country Inn. Below are general comments regarding the preferred Alternatives and the study in general:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Americans are in love with their Automobiles. If you go with 0 lanes and some type of Mass Transit, no one will use the Mass Transit. Please consider only adding Mass Transit, thus forcing people to use it, otherwise we will have 6 lanes of traffic jams instead of 4 lanes and not be any better off in 2025 than we are today after 15 years of construction.</li> <li>2. Do not put all your eggs in one basket. An additional alternative should have been considered where Mass Transit is added to I-70 and another Interstate is put across the state from Denver to Grand Junction following the existing Routes for a total of 330 miles (note that 66 miles is already new 4 lane road).       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rt 285 Denver to Johnson Village = 118 Miles</li> <li>- Rt 24 Johnson Village to Poncha Springs = 21 Miles</li> <li>- Rt 50 Poncha Springs to Montrose = 125 Miles</li> <li>- Rt 50 Montrose to Grand Junction = 66 Miles (95% already is 4 lane Road)</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>This East/West Interstate Route across the state would reduce traffic on I-70, provide an alternate route when I-70 is closed (i.e. rockslides in Glenwood Canyon, Debeque Canyon, major truck accidents which close I-70 for lengthy periods of time, etc), and provide the opportunity for a positive economic impact on other parts of the state.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns.</p> <p>Edward C. Miller        Grand Junction, CO 81503</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	140	Miller, William	Public	1/12/2005	<p>I am William Miller. I'm a Colorado native and I reside in Idaho Springs.</p> <p>Now, let's get down to reality here. I do not favor mass transit, elevated railway, or bus system because I don't think it will be cost effective. It won't be utilized as you project. I find that I won't be able to get my canoe on it or my ATV or my mountain bike or my sailboat, or whatever, to go west. And if I did, my destination would not be at the terminal. It would be out in the hills somewhere and I'd be afoot.</p> <p>I suspect very strongly that if you do put in these massive transit systems, it won't be cost effective.</p>	Transcripts

					<p>especially if you have to subsidize them with money. Whatever you do, let's make it cost effective. We are the taxpayers where the funding is.</p> <p>I won't use massive transit, because when I get off, I'm afoot. And in my special little corner of the world I am accustomed to going to, I will not be able to go there.</p> <p>Let's have a little reality check here and not think that the total usage of the I-70 corridor is from DIA to Vail; it is not.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
Categorized Comment	736	Minor, John	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? 6-lane highway + space for future mass transit (cost to be determined)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	126	Montgomery, Autumn	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Hi, I'm Autumn Montgomery and live up here on Floyd Hill.</p> <p>We do need to prepare for the future: I understand that. After reviewing your proposals of the I-70 corridor, I believe that the AGS would be the best solution. I believe that it would best deal with concerns for alleviating the traffic, create the least impact environmentally, have the least impact financially, and would best prepare Colorado to be a leader in the future.</p> <p>I believe AGS will alleviate the traffic. People can jump on it with ease, travel for skiing, travel up here for shopping, be commuter-worry-free. We can generate revenue off of that as well.</p> <p>Environmentally, I believe it will least disrupt migratory patterns of animals, at least not change what we've probably already interfered with them with the road. We may not have to change the rivers. Tunnels might not need to be bored. We could use some existing -- I believe inside the Eisenhower Tunnel that the ventilation tunnel could be used and the motion of the AGS could help pull through some of that ventilation.</p> <p>And I believe too that financially that AGS could perhaps be completed sooner than the 15-year project, which would less disrupt the economy here in Clear Creek County and the state of Colorado. I believe 15 years of tying up traffic would discourage people from coming to Colorado who wish to ski, and that will impact Colorado greatly, not to mention all along the corridor what it will do to small business here. I don't think we can survive the 15-year mess if we went with one of the asphalt-widening projects.</p> <p>I also believe that the AGS can help to generate income to pay for itself by hauling goods, perhaps at night, or by having private cars that people could buy to use as part of advertising. Maybe that would help pay for that as well.</p> <p>Finally, I think AGS would refresh Colorado's forward thinking or preparing for the future. It could lead us into being competitive for future businesses. The other alternatives would be outdated by 2025, so we'd have more population, more traffic, and what would be accomplished? I don't think much.</p> <p>We can no longer think like an industrial nation, that the nation of the future, just as the computer has changed how we think and communicate and how we network with each other, we need to think more forward in how we travel.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	162	Montgomery, Autumn	Public	1/15/2005	<p>Hi, I'm here as a citizen. I live up on Floyd Hill. I love Colorado. I've grown up here. All the time that I've grown up here, I've seen changes come along, some good, some bad, but this one has me concerned. And I have questions.</p> <p>I'm curious, as I'm looking at the proposal for monorail, why it had to be tied to asphalt. I'm not sure that those have to be hand in hand. And I'm not sure why in these proposals there is asphalt that has to be laid first in the projections for monorail to happen in 2030, according to the charts I was looking at back there.</p> <p>I don't know if we're afraid of innovation or if we're just kind of lazy in our thinking that asphalt's the way we've always done it so let's keep on. I don't think monorail would be more costly when you consider the tradeoffs that you've talked about, when you consider the price of how -- of the increase in oil as it becomes more scarce, when you consider that asphalt will need to be reapplied every six years, and when you consider, as the highway is built, businesses will die out, people will avoid congestion on the road, and tourism will fade. People will choose to move away, it will cost Colorado a larger price tag than you can even imagine.</p> <p>Monorail's not to be feared. It's innovative, but we shouldn't fear that. When you consider that asphalt widening, the tunnels through our beautiful landscapes, dig up harmful residues from days of mining and will take away some of the homes of my neighbors and friends, then I would be afraid! And I would be afraid that partway through the project it possibly could fail because people cannot move around I-70 any longer and that the costs will have risen.</p> <p>Monorail's not going to be any more work than asphalt. Monorail can be built without distracting traffic flow, at least any more than road closures would. Monorail can offer freight train travel while still allowing travel of individual cars who seek more remote places. Monorail can help pay for itself by hauling goods. It can take less time to build.</p> <p>I think that we need to ask ourselves, Why isn't monorail considered as a preferred option for improvement? I think that we do need to be aware as citizens and keep asking questions. I think we would like more time to ask all the questions that we have as we look over all the information that you have for us. Why can't monorail happen now? Why wait? Why does more asphalt need to be included in the monorail? Many, many questions that we all need to ask as citizens.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	363	Montgomery, Autumn	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/16/2005	<p>Hello, I'm Autumn Montgomery, and I'm here tonight representing the Floyd Hill Area Property Homeowners Association. We have several concerns with the I-70 mountain corridor draft PEIS.</p> <p>First of all, we feel that the study was supposed to be based on a 50-year vision, and this document does not address the needs of the state for this 50-year vision. The association would request that the Colorado Department of Transportation expand the scope of the PEIS to include a 50-year solution.</p> <p>The association would like CDOT to consider solutions that include mobility -- the ability of us residents and travelers to get around to and from local establishments such as our schools, shopping, and emergency access, as well as looking at the construction funding availability for the entire construction period. We feel that some of these issues are scheduled to be addressed during Tier II, and this is not acceptable before beginning on a huge project like this. These things need to be known.</p> <p>Also, we would like -- the association would like CDOT to provide alternate routes or alternate transit methods before impacting the I-70 corridor with construction. Alternate routes that could have alleviated the east to west travel were dismissed at outset because of the social and economic impacts of these alternatives. Alternate local routes are all but nonexistent. Alternative methods of transit, such as the monorail, should be considered where the construction does not have to impact the highway footprint.</p> <p>Another concern is the economic impact to our community. It may be devastating. Commuters that live on Floyd Hill but work in the greater Denver metro area may have to relocate to gain acceptable transit time due to off-peak closures and delays. Recreational travelers will have to plan on delays and extended travel times for their entire -- for the entire construction period.</p> <p>The association would like to see the Colorado Department of Transportation provide solutions that will be significantly better than the current preferred alternatives. The Floyd Hill Area Property Homeowners Association is also completely opposed to the tolling of local residents. This study was identified solely as an alternative for funding, and we believe -- the association would request that the report for alternate means of funding does not include tolling from local residents.</p> <p>With all due respect to the people that have put so much effort into this document, the document and the recommended alternatives miss the mark. The Colorado Department of Transportation has given the people of the state of Colorado and the residents of the Floyd Hill area preferred alternatives that will reduce the quality of life for us and for our families for the next 15 to 20 years.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	489	Montgomery, Daniel	Public	5/12/2005	<p>To whom it may concern, The White River Plan has approved Gondolas between ski resorts. Why not include the towns in the plan. That would make every unit in the bedroom communities ski in-ski out. Huge real estate boom. Eliminating the need for a car. Start with a small community for a "test track". For example Keystone to Silverthorne, eight miles. That scenario should be measured for reduced usage on I-70.</p>	Online



So the cost is realtively cheap for a current gondola, a drop in the bucket.  
 Put a little funding into resort shuttle from Denver to keep it cheap, give them a priority hour on I-70.  
 CME shuttle takes 1 hour and forty minutes off peak times. Can't beat that. Make it efficient and cheap  
 for front range users. A chunk of the 3.5 million Summit County skier visits have transportation included  
 with the lodging-ski package. Why go all the way to Eagle with the \$7 billion for the failed plan?  
 Market the heck out of it.  
 As a local I'll get a biking-ski mecca. I'll be a one car family, huge savings.  
 My kids will get to school efficiently. Today kids are offered 1.5 hours round trip Dillon-Frisco ,no thanks  
 I'll drive them.  
 This idea puts people out of work, car makers, oil companies.  
 Cargo would go well on it.  
 Next time your driving in Summit think how nice it would be without beer trucks, garbage trucks, fuel  
 trucks, empty busses, drunks.  
 We can still keep driving, but I want an alternative in transportation.  
 Starbucks will fund this, since thier at every terminal.  
 If your reading this while wearing a suit and tie go ahead and delete this message, and please don't  
 have my buried in a stadium.  
 Give me some negative feedback and I will hammer you with logic.  
 danmontgomery1@juno.com  
 Dillon,Colorado.

Here is a letter and response from Gary Lindstrom.

I will put my comments in red. I am on the house floor on our wireless system. I love it. Makes things so  
 much easier.

> So you agree that a cable from Keystone and Dillon is a good idea? I WOULD AGREE THAT WE  
 NEED TO HAVE A PLAN AND THAT THE PLAN COULD BE BUILT IN INCREMENTS. Vail  
 > would put that up for free. I HAVE NOT HEARD VAIL SAY THAT. Money is not the problem. PEOPLE  
 WANT A SOLUTION BUT THEY ARE NOT WILLING TO PAY FOR IT. Access is the  
 > problem or it would have been done already. THE WHITE RIVER FOREST PLAN ALREADY HAS A  
 DESIGNATED RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH THE FOREST.  
 > The fixed guideway proposed is old technology. Rubber on cement, powered  
 > by a coal burning plant in Commerce City. The vehicle to cargo weight  
 > ratios are all screwy. \$7 billion  
 > C-dot is in the road business. They admitted that in the news this  
 > winter. And they're good at it. I PERSONALLY DO NOT THINK THAT THE SOLUTION HAS BEEN  
 INVENTED YET. WE NEED TO PLAN FOR THE FUTURE AND SECURE THE RIGHT OF WAY SO  
 WE ARE READY WHEN THE TECHNOLOGY COMES UP TO SPEED. TOM HOPKINS FROM VAIL  
 CLAIMS TO KNOW OF A TECHNOLOGY THAT COULD BE BUILT TODAY. I TALK TO HIM ON A  
 REGULAR BASIS IN FACT I AM HAVING COFFEE WITH HIM THIS FRIDAY. WE NEED A PLAN AND  
 THE TECHNOLOGY AND THEN WE CAN GO TO CDOT AND FHWA WITH A PLAN.  
 > Vail is buying a wind farm to power eight chairlifts. Amazing. The  
 > amusement park gives motivation to be innovative. Money is the real  
 > motivator. If the new guideway can be a moneymaker for itself, funding  
 > will not be an issue. SEVEN BILLION DOLLARS IS A MAJOR ISSUE.  
 > My idea is based on the hi-speed quad chairlift technology. Cable with  
 > detachable pods. A typical gondola car seems a little bulky and its  
 > vehicle/cargo weight ratio is bad.  
 > The vehicles can range from lightweight aerodynamic pods that detach  
 > to your house. to cargo pods. IT HAS TO BE TIED TO MASS TRANSIT FROM DENVER TO EAGLE  
 COUNTY AIRPORT. WE SKI 3.5 MILLION SKIERS A YEAR IN SUMMIT COUNTY, MORE THAN THE  
 ENTIRE STATE OF UTAH.  
 >  
 > The cable runs at 40mph from the Frisco to Breckenridge in 20 minutes.  
 > Terminals make Frisco ski in/ ski out. WOW. Get your real estate now. The  
 > DIA tarmac skier bus to Frisco gets a priority hour on I-70.  
 >  
 > Gary I disagree that money is the hurdle here.  
 >  
 > The real problem is like you said in the paper. Our addictions. And no  
 > offense to you Gary, the politicians that support our addictions are a  
 > problem too. I AM NOT OFFENDED AND YOU ARE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. WE NEED TO WEAN  
 OURSELVES OFF OF FOSSL FUELS AND RUBBER TIERED VEHICLES.  
 > Summit County showed it is ready for change last November.  
 >  
 > Unique here in Summit with the infrastructure to build a chairlift at  
 > 13,000ft. Paperwork is their only problem  
 >  
 > Get the money from the Summit Stage budget. School bus budget. Less need  
 > for improvements on Hwy.9 and I-70 for that matter. If you don't need a  
 > car in Summit County, the I-70 problem is solved. IF WE HAD ALL OF THE MONEY FROM THE  
 STAGE AND EVERY OTHER GOVERNMENT IT WOULD TAKE 100 YEARS.  
 >  
 > The real problem is access.  
 >  
 > We have a hundred miles of fixed guideway in the area. Fixed guideway  
 > courses are offered at our local college. Lets put a test track down in  
 > a practical spot.  
 > Gary, thanks for the open door. Give me some chatter.  
 > Dan Montgomery, Dillon.

Categorized Comment	476	Montgomery, Daniel	Public	12/13/2004	This idea involves existing technology. Up to the minute information network for scheduling and efficiency.	Online
					<p>Scenario: Bob in Pittsburgh plans his trip on the computer. His transportation and lodging are a package deal. He even sent his ski gear ahead a day or two to the hotel or ski area. He printed his luggage tags from home with a final destination for each piece. He actually chose Keystone for his ski gear.</p> <p>In Pittsburgh, Bob got dressed for skiing at Keystone. The flight is 3.5 hours and the bus is another 2 hours.</p> <p>The big transition time of baggage pick up, rental car and getting to the resort is gone.</p> <p>The concourse At D.I.A. with arriving ski traffic has deluxe coaches waiting. Bob knew exact times and choices of vans or buses to get to his destination.</p> <p>Bob picked up his rental car at the ski area and drove to his hotel. Or better yet, rode the detachable pod back to Dillon and left his car in Pittsburgh.</p> <p>How much does a chairlift cost?</p> <p>The detachable pod has made every condo in Dillon ski-in/ski-out. Property values are thru the roof. Infrastructure costs have dropped and the crowds are handled.</p> <p>That scenario is realistic. Bob in Pittsburgh could plan with someone in Denver to share a van.</p> <p>Give the Denver people free parking; they'll gladly jump on for low cost.</p> <p>The residents in the mountains need to use it too.</p> <p>A simple web site could fill in the vacancies on Bob's van. The cost has to be \$10 no \$50. CDOT help offset.</p> <p>A web site could have a forecast and expected travel times and people would plan accordingly. A web site alone could spread the traffic out to off peak hours for only twenty bucks a month.</p> <p>Trucks need to be more efficient too. They need to be in the loop with Pittsburgh Bob and the peak hours. They want to be. We can put Wi-Fi in Ogallala. Trucks should use Hwy.6 thru Clear Creek Canyon. It is one steady grade, instead of up and down Floyd Hill. They might like it. Especially with the new road to Blackhawk and Central City diverting that traffic.</p> <p>The land between Frisco, Dillon and the resorts is all at the same elevation. That is where the mag-lev system needs to be. Turn the place into Disneyland and they won't want a car.</p> <p>This plan addresses the future much better than a plan for more lanes. A priority lane for mass transit is must.</p> <p>Good luck, Dan Montgomery, Dillon.</p>	
Categorized Comment	163	Montgomery, Lou	Public	1/15/2005	<p>Im Lou Montgomery. I live on Floyd Hill also. And I just have one question.</p> <p>I'd like to see a cost of the monorail outside of the I-70 footprint. You know, it may be less than going along the highway. And also, that was an interesting idea on the rail. You know, a regular rail or steam train or something like that.</p> <p>I feel you're going to displace a lot of people. I don't live up in that area, so it probably won't affect me as much as them. But, you know, it's -- that'd be pretty hard to stuff -- have someone shove down your</p>	Transcripts

					throat when you don't want it. Thanks.	
Categorized Comment	583	Montgomery, Lou	Public	2/16/2005	According to the study by the School of Mines, you did not do a full evaluation of the AGS system.  Also a neighbor of mine was told by one of your engineers that basically your costs for an AGS system were pulled out of a hat.  It appears your statement is skewed towards more lanes of highway even though it will lead to more congestion for the next 15 years during construction.  I am for minimal action!  How about a different route to the western slope?	Form
Categorized Comment	43	Morgan, Bryan	Public	1/15/2005	E-mail Updates  Please add me [BRMorgan@tmo.blackberry.net] to your e-mail list for updates on projects and public involvement. The area of most interest to me is the I-70 corridor through the mountains. As a soon to be Realtor, I'm greatly interested in congestion and environmental impact of our beautiful mountains.  I have to say that I'm very happy that the CDOT does not have the funding for a monorail at this time since it would be a waste of money. The only benefit it would bring would be during the winter ski season. The summer months are packed with motorists who are travelling to camp, boat, drive [scenery/pleasure], and other activities that would not utilize a monorail at all. The money would be better spent building an elevated portion above the existing motorway with limited interchanges (one before every major stopping point/interest) similar in fashion to the Glenwood Canyon project. The state [or RTD] could still offer Bio-diesel bus service to all the major ski areas as well in the wintertime.  There are so many possibilities for the future. The biggest priority should be planning for it. The past years have been so poorly planned that the only improvement I see is when the roads are congested to the point that it is choking everyone.  Remember this... Prior proper planning prevents piss poor performance!  Bryan Morgan BRMorgan@tmo.blackberry.net	Online
Categorized Comment	535	Morgan, Matt	Public	5/22/2005	I think that we should leave I-70 alone. Spend any money keeping in in top shape. The traffic jams only happen on Sunday afternoons, and occasionally on Friday nights or Saturday mornings. They happen every morning and every afternoon in Denver!  I travel this stretch of road frequently (Frisco to Denver) and simply know to pick the right times to travel.  Compare to a business telephone with five lines. Most of the time they are not used, or maybe one or two. Once in a while they are all full. Not very often.  Thank You	Online
Categorized Comment	193	Morrison, Roger	Public	2/16/2005	With the high cost of fuel, mass transit to the ski areas would greatly benefit those who can find bargain season passes, but can not afford to buy 150 to 200 miles worth of gas, 3to5 times a week, or even 3 to 5 times a month! For retirees on a fixed income, this would be of great benefit, and reduce traffic volume! On weekends and holidays, this would be of great value to all!	Online
Categorized Comment	244	Mosbaugh, Lynne	Public	2/28/2005	I wish to cast my vote in favor of mass transit. Widening to six lanes seems an expensive, short sighted solution. I think mass transit would be a longer term, wiser solution. I would be willing to pay a tax and pay a user fee to ride mass transit. I've ridden the trains in Europe and found them to be excellent transportation. Thank you.	Online
Categorized Comment	478	Bekkedal Homeowners Association	Associations & Special Interest Groups	4/12/2005	Dear Ms. Paulsen,  Thank you for making sure that the Bekkedal Homeowners Association gets its comments in on the I70 Corridor improvements. The Bekkedal is a residential subdivision that is located one mile south of Breckenridge in Summit County.  A strong majority of our homeowners feel that adding lanes to I-70 is not the answer to the current overcrowding. We hope that there is a way to add a public transport rail or coach system. If a new lane must be developed, it should be for public transport only, to encourage alternatives to the personal automobile. A travel tax for road usage at peak volume traffic times is also an option.  I regret that I cannot attend the meeting in Summit County this week, but I appreciate your passing along these comments to the committee.  Joyce Mosher Secretary to the Board of Directors and Homeowners	Email
Categorized Comment	597	Mounsey, William	Public	5/24/2005	Question 1. Why did CDOT drop all consideration of the linear induction motor monorail? #2. Why doesn't CDOT recognize that dollar cost figures are no longer valid for quarter of a century in the future estimates, and compute in some unit of energy (BTU, joule etc.) which means of propulsion is most energy efficient in moving people and goods at high speed along the I70 corridor? WBM	Online
Categorized Comment	598	Mounsey, William	Public	5/24/2005	Question 1. Why did CDOT drop all consideration of the linear induction motor monorail? #2. Why doesn't CDOT recognize that dollar cost figures are no longer valid for quarter of a century in the future estimates, and compute in some unit of energy (BTU, joule etc.) which means of propulsion is most energy efficient in moving people and goods at high speed along the I70 corridor? WBM	Online
Categorized Comment	503	Mulvihill, Patti	Public	5/16/2005	I am writing to state my concern over the planning of the I-70 corridor construction through Clear Creek County.  First of all, I have great concern over the lack of alternative transportation in traveling I-70 to the ski resorts. We now have the opportunity to change the way we travel in order to be less reliant on foreign sources of oil and to be pro active on environmental issues such as pollution and other health problems. We need to also think of providing alternate routes to the mountains other than I-70 being the main vein into these destinations.  I have concern over the health and economic impacts this construction would have on these counties. Many of the communities along the corridor are in close range of the highway. Please consider the impact of the people living close by the construction. Has there been consideration to the ability of travelers being able to stop and use their tax dollars in these communities during the construction?  In addition, I am hoping the plan can be context sensitive in design wherever projects are done. And limit construction in Clear Creek to major pinch points, then reassess. And equally important, please plan for future transit, now.  Thank you,  Patti Mulvihill Clear Creek County resident	Online
Categorized Comment	757	Murano, Pamela	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  No response.	Written

Categorized Comment	298	Murphy, Bill	Public	2/9/2005	<p>I'm Bill Murphy, I live in the Idaho Springs area, and I have some comments that come from just being a daily user of I-70. I'm either on my way to Denver or I'm on my way to Vail. Every day of the week something like that's going on, so I use this corridor, as I just mentioned -- this is really our home, but we use the word "corridor" so everybody has that</p> <p>Some of the things that I see with this -- as I understand it, the PEIS is that currently we have -- it's supposedly a \$4 billion project, but there is only really \$1.4 billion, I think, that's available that we know of that we're sure is there. So that leaves close to \$3 billion that may or may not appear. And I think as we watch our world today and our governments today, I guess the firmness of money being available is probably about like Jell-O on a hot day; it may be there, it may not.</p> <p>So, with that, if you have the money now, let's use some of it right now to take care of the short-term problems, because the short-term plan seems to be an awful lot of what the PEIS is about. So let's take a look at the pinch points and you can probably fix that with maybe the money that you have, and at that point in time, see what that mitigation can do and see if there really are the problems that we think there would be.</p> <p>As I drive I-70 to Vail, all I see is there's about 20 hours a week that it's a real pain on Saturday and Sundays. You've got ten hours on Saturday and ten hours on Sunday, five hours in the mornings and five hours in the afternoon, that it just doesn't work very well. The rest of the times that I drive I-70, I'm often by myself, it is not -- it just is not a problem.</p> <p>I do not know if the growth projections -- although they do come, I guess, from the county is what we were told -- those growth projections are probably there but how those numbers were used to determine traffic flow, I think that it actually has been done by CDOT. And I don't know if those are good numbers. I haven't seen anything that would even indicate that that would become a problem.</p> <p>The pinch points are the problem, and I think those should be addressed. Once those are addressed, take a look at, I guess, some of the alternatives. It's kind of at this point that I -- it's the Colorado Department of Transportation that I don't hear them talking about transportation. They're talking about highways and paving, and that kind of makes it the Colorado Road and Paving Department.</p> <p>Anyway, I think -- I guess what I would like is for CDOT to recognize the folly of just having and putting all your eggs in one basket of I-70. There's been a lot of talk this evening about alternatives, and it just makes sense when you have a Front Range corridor that's 40 or 50 miles long with most of the population funneling to one point and heading west, that's not -- that's not logical. I have trouble thinking that way. I would ask that CDOT have trouble thinking that way also and maybe get outside the box.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	50	Murphy, Bill	Public	1/18/2005	<p>First, work on highway solutions as that benefits the entire state as well as other states. Forget forever any proposals that deal with rail alternatives particularly if the rail stops at the resorts. Just think of how many shut down events have happened on the railroad from Kremlin to the Utah line. Numerous per year.</p> <p>This is not just a resort problem. It is a state commerce problem. HOV alternating lanes on a six lane highway to at least Glenwood Springs is a good start. Of course you still need another bore for the Eisenhower Tunnel. Tax payers should support efforts to move commerce and visitors through the entire state, but don't let it become a special interest issue for the resorts or environmentalists. Hybrid cars and alternative fuels are already being used in cars and buses and will continue to grow in popularity and financial necessity.</p> <p>bill murphy 738 centauri dr. grand junction, co 81506 bill@horizonsre.com</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	429	Murphy, William	Public	2/26/2005	<p>Let me help you analyze the information CDOT is providing and help you take a peak into the future that is being presented to you by CDOT....a future that for some reason sounds good to you.</p> <p>Here are two statistics for you</p> <p>From CDOT who you believe is your savior: - 15 YEARS of construction with no thought to alternative routes</p> <p>Translated that means 15 years that the ski areas you represent will take it in the shorts on the bottom line. Why? The next statistic... from your own website</p> <p>Skier visits in 1993-94 season = 11.2M Skier visits in 2003-04 season = 11.3M</p> <p>In the period 1990 to 2003 the population has grown nationally 14 % And locally it has grown 35 %</p> <p>Could it be that your number of skiers per population available to ski is dropping is because they can't get here?</p> <p>It is not easy to get to the resorts because of the choking of I-70 traffic. This plan will cause devastating choking for the 15 years it will take to build it (given CDOT can find the money they don't have to complete the project.) What happens if they get halfway through and have to wait a 2,3 or 4 years longer then projected to get financing?</p> <p>Remember 2 summers ago when our Governor made the statement "Colorado is on fire" and the tourist industry tanked and is still trying to rebound? That is not a man of vision. Can you imagine what will happen to the skier visits when the word gets out, "Colorado is a parking lot" due to construction for 15 YEARS or more?</p> <p>Without alternative routes and alternative means of transportation and without vision you will have failed your mission to promote the ski industry in Colorado, you will have failed your clients.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	741	Natale, Kathryn	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>I think choke points should be fixed ASAP. Kathryn Natale. snowkatn2@hotmail.com 1263 Straight Creek Dr, Dillon, CO 80435</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	577	Nazzaro, Alan	Public	5/24/2005	<p>As A Colorado Citizen and an Economic Development Professional both in excess of 25 years. I find this PEIS to be totally lacking in depth of scope, substance and vision. Although this is an environmental study, the only criteria used for choosing the "preferred group of alternatives" was cost and technical feasibility. The environmental impacts of these alternatives were not seriously considered in the choice of the preferred group.</p> <p>Why is the document looking only 25 years out, 50 years should be the shortest planning threshold for an endeavor of this magnitude that will affect Colorado's economy for decades to come. Particularly with the projected population growth for the state over the next 25-50 years. CDOT's own projections show that the latent demand will already have reached capacity at the end of the 15 year construction period. This confirms that in 2025, the corridor will be no better off than it is today and in fact, the damage to the environment, economies (local &amp; state) and loss of the communities' integrity will have taken place.</p> <p>Water quality impacts due to maintenance activities were not taken into account. Water quality impacts due to the release of heavy metals into the stream system were not adequately addressed. Air quality degradation due to increased traffic, and the resulting health impacts to those who live along the corridor, should be fully analyzed and properly disclosed.</p> <p>There is inconsistent, inadequate, and even contradictory statements regarding commitment to mitigation.</p> <p>The report does not evaluate the economic impacts of the proposed 15 years of construction to Clear Creek County, its communities and its residents. Impacts are averaged out over a 9 county region even though most of the construction will take place in Clear Creek.</p> <p>There are reports missing from the document. The PEIS refers to the following processes/documents /reports, but does not include documents: ALIVE (Wildlife studies and proposed mitigation) SWEEP (Water, streams and wetlands studies and mitigation) Peer Review (Comments on the methodology used to project travel demand, in particular) Access to Gaming EIS Agreements regarding how the US Army Corps of Engineers will work with FHWA and CDOT during this NEPA process</p>	Online

## Disclosures regarding potential conflicts of interest

The cost cap was set at \$4 billion dollars, despite the fact that CDOT has identified only \$1.6 billion as firmly committed to this process over the next 20 years. Documentation disclosing how the contractor was selected for this \$20+ million study is inadequate or missing.

CDOT needs to address these issues and present their findings to the public in a manner that best informs the public prior to the Record of Decision being written.

The I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition (31 jurisdictions) has created a "Regionally Preferred Alternative". This alternative calls for planning and development of transit to proceed with highway improvements addressing the existing and most prevalent pinch points along the corridor and particularly in Clear Creek County. First, improvements are grouped in 4 phases, with evaluation between phases to determine whether to proceed to the next phase of highway improvements. CDOT MUST GIVE THIS PROPOSAL A FULL AND COMPLETE EVALUATION. I FIRMLY BELIEVE THIS PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE WILL HAVE THE LOWEST LEVEL OF IMPACT TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE AFFECTED COMMUNITIES ALONG THE CORRIDOR. THIS ALTERNATIVE ALSO REQUIRES CDOT'S FULL SUPPORT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSIT. Why be stuck on using 50 year old fossil fuel-based technology, we need to look to the future, look at alternative transportation systems that are more advanced and used the world-over. The corridor coalition has defined a magnificent "alluring" transportation system into the Colorado Rockies, that will be a magnet for residents and visitors alike! We can not and must not ignore the existing potential in these communities, we must build upon it.

Much of this corridor is tied directly to the history and the identity of Colorado. An EIS is intended to evaluate the effects alternative transportation improvements on communities and the environment through which they will pass. The PEIS does NOT meet the purpose and the underlying need that preserves community values and environmental sensitivity. There are hundreds and hundreds of structures, landscapes and view corridors throughout the affected corridor which will be severely impacted by the CDOT preferred alternative, which have not fully been analyzed nor detailed in this report. The Section 106 consultation is seriously flawed within the PEIS and alternatives were eliminated within Tier 1 without full knowledge of the potential direct effects to historic structures and character. Pertinent indirect effects which may constitute "constructive use" are well-defined, however the PEIS appears to have minimized these indirect effects and not identified potential constructive uses by alternatives. Specifically Noise and Visual effects have been minimized. Noise levels are already above acceptable standards, and View Corridors are already compromised in many areas along the corridor. Mitigation strategies are vague. Using a percentage for mitigation with each alternative (when they are all very different) is misleading. The test of "reasonableness" needs to include the economic/long term cost of destroying culture, history, the environment, and community value and their "sense of place" without which we have "NO COLORADO" to speak of.

In conclusion the "preferred alternatives" in the PEIS provide the worst case scenario through some of Colorado's most historic areas. The I-70 Corridor should be a magnificent multi-modal transportation system into and through the Colorado Rockies that respects and honors our history and our natural environment. The Alternatives in the PEIS (as presented) do not accomplish this vision for the future of our state. I urge you to issue a supplement, include equal information for all reviewers, and especially to adopt the Regionally Preferred Alternative created by the I-70 Coalition under the aegis of the Northwest Council of Governments. Please help protect the future of our state's economic, cultural and environmental health by keeping it connected to its past. Don't destroy the historical and enduring environmental legacies that are the treasures of Colorado in a feeble and misguided attempt to let more people access those very treasures.

Categorized Comment	314	Neely, Cindy	Public	29/2005	Hi. My name is Cynthia Neely. I'm from the Town of Georgetown.	Transcripts
					<p>I've been involved here in this issue I guess for longer than I care to think about. I spoke at an earlier gathering about the long-range vision and the imbalance between the purpose and need that I find in the PEIS. As Craig Abrahamson expressed, it seems, out of the purpose section, only the cost element was used at this point and not the other three elements of the environmental sensitivity, community values, and safety. And we noted that early.</p> <p>So I'd like to address three other things that you can put on the record for tonight, if I have enough time to get through all three of them. First, I hadn't planned to talk about it at all, but I will mention a couple of my preliminary concerns having to do with the historical resources of this valley. These historical resources are protected by law in two ways. One is called Section 4(f) of the Transportation Act, which indicates that all departments of transportation are required to avoid or minimize harm to both historic and recreational resources.</p> <p>Now, the PEIS, in Section 3.16 something, I haven't had to speak on this so I don't have the other piece to reference, that actually quotes that law -- that section of the law. That section of the law in 4(f) says that they are to avoid and minimize harm directly. Direct harm being, are you taking a property? Are you knocking them down or taking part of a property or through constructive use? Constructive use being impacting a property by noise, air pollutants, in such a way -- or by visual intrusion -- in such a way as to damage its historical or recreational value and integrity.</p> <p>In other words, if it becomes so loud that we cannot give tours in the Hamill House lawn anymore, then the highway will have taken constructive use of our historic property. The PEIS does discuss direct impacts, how many houses or which structures -- historical structures might be impacted directly, and then falls strangely silent on the discussion of constructive use.</p> <p>Constructive use is to be discussed at Tier II. If your alternative is already decided, then it's too late to start talking about how that alternative will go.</p> <p>Then, because Joanne is waving things at me already, Section 106 is the other portion that protects cultural and historical resources. This is out of the National Preservation Act, and it essentially indicates that any federal action has to take into account historic resources. We have gone through a good identification process of historic resources.</p> <p>We really have, and we have discussed what the impacts, again, could be; noise, visual, sound. But we get a dual message out of the PEIS. We get the message that all the options for mitigation are still on the table; however, we get the message that in Georgetown, Silver Plume, and Idaho Springs, we've done detailed planning and some of those options are off the table, that Idaho Springs is to get a duffie bag, and there can't be a tunnel at Georgetown/Silver Plume. Which message is the message? This is very unclear. It seems to me an internal conflict on how Section 106 is handled.</p> <p>And, very quickly, I've gone beyond the subject, which is public involvement. I was on the mountain corridor advisory committee. On the executive summary it lists a PEIS. There is a long list of federal agencies and other agencies contacted through the study. Chapter 6, pages 6-2 and 6-3 describe all of the committees. I searched for the results of those meetings. 6-1, 6-2 showed the results of scoping; then there's nothing.</p> <p>And having served on the MCAC, I can tell you, there aren't minutes that reflect the advice from the advisory committee. There are no summaries from the I-70 consulting party meetings. I searched in vain for the ALIVE agreement, what were the recommendations of the traffic model peer review committee and how were they addressed.</p> <p>As a member of the MCAC, I object to the language used in ES-2 to describe the MCAC process. The MCAC did not participate in the review of cost travel demand and environmental data. We were informed of that data, and fully informed. I would certainly agree with that. But we did not discuss what was reasonable and affordable. To participate means to share in; to discuss means an interactive conversation, and it didn't happen.</p> <p>In the words of the EPA, The public involvement did not result in a meaningful say. No one ever said, How can we solve this together? The MIS gave me an opportunity to participate in a real consensus building process. And, you know, I really, really hope the mountain communities can do that again.</p>	
					<p>My name is Cindy Neely. I'm also from Clear Creek County. I've lived in the town of Georgetown for the last 37 years.</p> <p>And the people from Eagle County, they wonder why so many of us are over here. 90 percent of the construction projected for any of those highway alternatives will occur in Clear Creek County.</p> <p>The bus in guideway would extend to Silverthorne, so, of course, there would be some construction that far. And I'm not saying that there aren't construction projects beyond Clear Creek County, but the way it is laid out currently in the PEIS, the major portion of any construction will take place in Clear Creek County.</p> <p>So it is important for us to comment, and it's important for us to comment publicly, and it is important for us to comment publicly in front of our Western Slope neighbors so that they also realize the kinds of concerns that we have.</p> <p>I promised at one point that I would read the document from beginning to end. I've managed Volume I, but I would like to direct a couple of comments towards just really Chapter 1 of Volume I, which is the purpose and need.</p> <p>And I can't second more strongly, like the gentleman that was up here talking about a vision statement. When I read the need and the purpose, I don't have a lot of comment on it. Need is there. And I think we recognize this need.</p> <p>And the purpose, when it discusses environmental values and the community values and safety and the</p>	

					<p>ability to implement, which are the four aspects of the purpose, they also seem to be all things that we could agree upon. The difficulty becomes in how are they balanced.</p> <p>And without vision -- without a clear vision statement, how do we achieve that balance? And I think the discussion that was held with CDOT and the FHWA a couple of weeks ago raised the concept of balance -- was discussed at length that this ultimately has to balance those purposes and needs.</p> <p>Right now, it appears the preferred alternative, and it certainly appears that way on the slide -- that the preferred alternatives took into consideration the cost portion of the ability to implement. It does not demonstrate that it also takes into consideration the other elements of the purpose. And we would like to clearly understand how the elements of purpose weighed in with the preferred alternative decisions.</p> <p>In that regard, the mitigation -- to speak to a specific mitigation in a specific locality, elevated lanes in Idaho Springs, speaking to that specific one is very confusing when what you're looking for is a mitigation policy of how sensitive areas will be treated with all the potentials of tools of mitigation left on the table.</p> <p>Does that specific action simply mean, you know, that's the place we can do something, and other place -- why is the specific action delineated, and actions, for instance, Georgetown, Silver Plume, and other places only indicate what has been taken off the table? That's very confusing in mitigation.</p> <p>One very specific thing noted in Chapter 1, the capacity and roadway deficiencies are outlined in Chapter 1 by highway segments. Clear Creek County is outlined on Figures 119, 121, and 123. And I'm not sure any of us would disagree about where those highway capacity and roadway deficiencies are.</p> <p>The difficulty is then at the end of that chapter, there's a statement saying that problematic area was then expanded to include the area of influence related to congestion at focal points. So instead of looking at those problematic areas in our summary -- executive summary, all of the sudden Clear Creek became a six-lane in all -- throughout, for all of the highway.</p> <p>So, ultimately, however, that's not the issue; division is the issue. What do we want Colorado to look like? What is our long-range vision for it? And I don't know what you will do with the stack of cards you pick up, but we would rather have a different vision for Clear Creek.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
Categorized Comment	130	Neely, Cindy	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Actually, I'm reserving my comments for CDOT to some other meeting. My comment is to this crowd: it's been a great evening. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for everybody coming here, but this will not do it. There are many more public hearings, and we need to have Clear Creek folks show up in other counties.</p> <p>Please, please get your notice of public meeting as you leave and stop by one in Denver or Grand Junction or somewhere along the line and help tell Clear Creek's story, as this is what needs to happen. Your elected representatives have been out there doing this and deserve high commendation for that, but there is nothing like having the public speak.</p> <p>Thank you all.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	74	Nelson, Bob	Public	1/15/2005	<p>My main concern is water quality impact on Clear Creek. Increased use of sand and mag chloride will have a significant impact on Clear Creek. As the Mayor Pro Temp of Golden, I am concerned with the increased use of sand and deicer products on our water supply, Clear Creek.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	569	Nesavich, John	Public	5/23/2005	<p>I own a cabin at mile marker 218, Hermans Gulch. These cabins are of Historic significance as they date back to the logging and mining days. Ours is the oldest of the group. We would like to see the highway from Bakersville to Eisenhower go to the south of the existing highway. There are no homes on the south side. We also need sound or noise reduction as our area gets decibals of 75 and up and this is just too loud. This area is used heavily by day hikers, showshoers, cross country skiers etc...summer and winter the parking lot is heavily used. There are horse back riders &amp; dogs on this trail as well. In short it is in constant use.</p> <p>I want to offer another thought to consider. Instead of looking at 3 lanes each way consider adding one lane to be used for west bound traffic in the AM and east bound traffic in the PM on the weekends. Then if you would address the bottle neck areas around Silver Plume to Georgetown and again just before Idaho Springs to Floyd Hill it would flow smoothly at a far lessor cost to the citizens. If the road were to swing to the south and north to avoid the homes and businesses on this stretch of road most residents could find this a workable solution. I believe you must also look at regulation of mufflers on the trucks not only on the engines but on the brakes as well.</p> <p>Judy L Nesavich 3240 S Monroe Denver Colorado 80210 303-691-0126</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	570	Nesavich, John	Public	5/23/2005	<p>I own a cabin at mile marker 218, Hermans Gulch. These cabins are of Historic significance as they date back to the logging and mining days. Ours is the oldest of the group. We would like to see the highway from Bakersville to Eisenhower go to the south of the existing highway. There are no homes on the south side. We also need sound or noise reduction as our area gets decibals of 75 and up and this is just too loud. This area is used heavily by day hikers, showshoers, cross country skiers etc...summer and winter the parking lot is heavily used. There are horse back riders &amp; dogs on this trail as well. In short it is in constant use.</p> <p>I want to offer another thought to consider. Instead of looking at 3 lanes each way consider adding one lane to be used for west bound traffic in the AM and east bound traffic in the PM on the weekends. Then if you would address the bottle neck areas around Silver Plume to Georgetown and again just before Idaho Springs to Floyd Hill it would flow smoothly at a far lessor cost to the citizens. If the road were to swing to the south and north to avoid the homes and businesses on this stretch of road most residents could find this a workable solution. I believe you must also look at regulation of mufflers on the trucks not only on the engines but on the brakes as well.</p> <p>Judy L Nesavich 3240 S Monroe Denver Colorado 80210 303-691-0126</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	501	Nesavich, John	Public	5/15/2005	<p>I think any improvements or widening of I70 at the mile marker 218 and the herman gulch trail head should be made to the south of the highway and no widening to the north of the highway.</p> <p>John Nesavich</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	746	Neubecker, Ken	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>My comments will be in the comments submitted by Colorado Trout Unlimited, which I can forward once we get them finalized. Ken Neubecker PO Box 1448 16 E. Foxglove Lane Eagle, CO 81631 eagleriver@eagleranch.com</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	343	Nickum, David	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/16/2005	<p>My name's David Nickum. I'm the executive director of Colorado Trout Unlimited, 8600-member conservation group along the state, including chapters along the I-70 corridor.</p> <p>We're very concerned about the aquatic systems along the highway, including Clear Creek and Eagle River watershed. Our concern is that it appears that the driving consideration that is separating alternatives is cost -- financial cost only, without consideration of environmental issues and without consideration of the externality factor of costs that are imposed elsewhere under the different alternatives.</p> <p>We know that the discussion of endangered species, which does not include greenback cutthroat trout -- the federally accredited species that was recently found in the headwater areas of Clear Creek close to the Eisenhower Tunnel. It's a major consideration that should be factored into the EIS.</p> <p>The discussion of recreation focuses on organized developed recreation opportunities and really does not address nonstructural recreational activities such as fishing along the corridor, which is a major use in each of the watershed affected by the project.</p> <p>A major point of concern to us is winter maintenance and its basis of water quality. Existing highway operations are already creating significant water quality problems in areas like Straight Creek and the Blue River, as well as in Clear Creek and Black Gore Creek, Gore Creek and the Eagle River.</p>	Transcripts

In the EIS, it indicates mitigation measures to recover only 25 percent to 80 percent of the sand applied each year, which means a steady influx of sediment into these streams and, over the long haul, serious adverse effects as is already being seen in Black Creek.

Some of those issues are especially troubling because the process -- the streams and wetlands environmental enhancement program that had been established by DOT to better flesh out some of these aquatic issues and mitigation needs was abruptly terminated by DOT midway through the process.

And we strongly encourage DOT to reconvene that process and use it as a better way of identifying environmental -- aquatic environmental issues for the different alternatives and the mitigation needs to be fed into the EIS. We think the EIS without that kind of information results in an EIS that is inadequate, and the EIS is inadequate and does not fully consider the cumulative effects of the project.

So in conclusion, we urge CDOT to restart its dialogue for the stakeholders and the SWEEP process and to broaden its perspective beyond purely financial prospects that's driving the selling point.

Categorized Comment	636	Colorado Trout Unlimited	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	David Nickum Executive Director Colorado Trout Unlimited  May 24, 2005  Ms. Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Ave. Lakewood, CO 80228 By email: jean.wallace@fhwa.dot.gov (hard copy to follow)  Dear Ms. Wallace:  Colorado Trout Unlimited (CTU) has reviewed the I-70 Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) and offers the attached comments.  CTU has serious concerns about the findings of the draft PEIS and the process that Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) has used in coming to the conclusions in the document. CDOT has not conducted an open and meaningful public involvement program and has not actively sought public input on such important measures as disclosing likely impacts of alternatives, and avoiding, minimizing and mitigating the adverse impacts. Instead, programmatic mitigation proposals are couched in ambiguous terms and do not represent meaningful mitigation policy.  Second, CDOT has not adequately addressed the complete array of potentially feasible alternatives. While it is true that some 20 alternatives are displayed in the draft PEIS most are variations on the same theme. About half of the alternatives are dismissed for what appears to be an arbitrary cost criterion, without adequate consideration of all costs or of benefits, both monetary and non-monetary. No attempt is made to determine or quantify the potential environmental, cultural or social costs of different alternatives, nor even to quantify monetary costs of mitigation. Without a more thorough analysis of these issues on which to base a decision, it is arbitrary for CDOT to dismiss these alternatives from further consideration.  Third, the proposed strategy of preparing a programmatic (Tier 1) EIS is inappropriate for NEPA compliance on this project. Programmatic documents (rarely used by federal agencies) are called into play when it isn't clear what the scope of a project will be and therefore, environmental impacts cannot be adequately determined or documented to share with the public. Consequently, the decisions facing federal agencies are more those of policy-related matters and not of site specific issues. That clearly isn't the case for this project. In the draft PEIS FHWA is proposing a specific highway corridor and different possible configurations of highway cross sections. Given that level of information, specific adverse environmental effects can be reasonably anticipated and disclosed. A more reasonable approach would be to identify site specific impacts from the proposal under different alternatives. If future activities lead to changes in project design, then supplemental NEPA documents could be developed as needed. The result would be better planning, more efficient use of limited resources, and more certainty of what the likely impacts of this proposal would be before any commitments are made. The use of a programmatic EIS at this time will frustrate the purposes of NEPA, that is, ensuring that information (including on environmental impacts) is developed, disclosed, and used to inform federal decision-making. Instead, this process attempts to push forward a decision in the absence of adequate information on environmental impacts by inappropriately segmenting NEPA analysis and obscuring the true impacts of different alternatives.  In section 102 of NEPA, Congress authorized and directed that "all agencies of the Federal Government shall ... include in every recommendation or report on proposals for ... major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment a detailed statement by the responsible official on ... the environmental impact of the proposed action [and] any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided, should the proposal be implemented." Because the draft PEIS does not adequately disclose the site-specific impacts of the alternatives (and thereby the significance of their removal from further analysis), it is unclear how FHWA can meet this direction to provide a "detailed statement" on environmental impacts. Rather, it appears that FHWA proposes to make a significant decision but defer its detailed analysis and disclosure to a subsequent stage. We ask that you inform us and the public of who is, for NEPA purposes, the responsible official for this process.  Fourth, the draft PEIS does not adequately address, at any level, the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity (mitigation). CDOT started a pilot program to identify potential strategic (policy) level mitigation, using Clear Creek as an example. CTU was an active participant in this Streams and Wetlands Ecological Enhancement Program (SWEEP). Unfortunately CDOT chose to abandon SWEEP in 2002 and as such there is no clear, meaningful commitment to mitigation in the draft PEIS. The SWEEP process should be reconstituted prior to the issuance of a revised draft and meaningful programs developed that will support real mitigation for the losses of streams and wetlands habitat that are likely to occur under the alternatives, where such impacts cannot be avoided.  More detailed CTU comments appear on the attached pages. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this I-70 PEIS.  Sincerely,  David Nickum  cc: Cecelia Joy, CDOT Colorado Department of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement & Section 4(f) Evaluation  Additional Comments of Colorado Trout Unlimited  Colorado Trout Unlimited (CTU) is the state's leading conservation organization dedicated to conservation, protection, and restoration of cold water fisheries and their watersheds. CTU has reviewed the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on the Expansion of the I-70 Corridor and finds it to be lacking in a number of key areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Inappropriate Use of a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement</li><li>o Discussion of Cumulative Impacts</li><li>o Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitment of Resources</li><li>o Lack of appropriate policy-level discussion of mitigation</li><li>o Inadequate Consideration of Costs used to Constrain Alternatives Analysis</li><li>o Clean Water Act compliance</li><li>o Specific Comments on impact determinations</li><li>o Other concerns</li></ul> Inappropriate Use of a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS):  A programmatic environmental impact statement is a document infrequently used by agencies of the federal government to assess impacts of a proposed action that is not clearly defined in its entirety thus making it difficult to identify specific impacts of the proposed action. Often a PEIS is used to demonstrate that an agency has considered environmental values while making a decision at a stage of project planning. The existing document does not rise to that standard.  Section 1-1 (Summary Purpose and Need) identifies the purpose of this EIS as "...focuses on broad approaches to address travel demand and performance of transportation systems in the context of the communities and environmental setting of this corridor." In fact, the draft PEIS goes much further. It identifies twenty alternative transportation scenarios. From this group of alternatives several are chosen as preferred and will move on for more detailed examination and analysis at the Tier 2 level. The other alternatives will apparently be dropped from any further consideration regardless of merit. This is inappropriate.  By deferring meaningful discussion of specific impacts to Tier 2 and secondary documents the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) are denying the public the opportunity to understand and evaluate the full magnitude of impacts that will result from this project under each of the alternatives. The approach being used segments the impact analysis in an <th>Email</th>	Email
---------------------	-----	--------------------------	--	-----------	--	-------

attempt to lessen the display of impacts on a project-wide basis. It also excludes alternatives which may become more attractive than the "preferred" alternatives after a more detailed analysis is conducted. The proposed Tier 2 level of analysis should extend to the full spectrum of proposed alternatives, in order to comply with NEPA requirements as described on FHWA's website (<http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/projdev/docueis.htm>).

Colorado Trout Unlimited recognizes that FHWA and CDOT will receive funding in increments over a multi-year period. Never-the-less, NEPA requires that FHWA analyze the potential project impacts of the entire project, to the extent they can be determined, at one time.

An alternative approach, that would better serve the public need to understand the magnitude of this proposal on the social and natural environment, would be to re-develop and issue a draft EIS that is more specific in its impact analysis and discusses the entire project in detail. Colorado Trout Unlimited requests that FHWA abandon this ill conceived multi-tiered NEPA strategy and replace it with a site specific EIS for the entire corridor proposal, that can then be supplemented as conditions warrant.

#### Cumulative Impacts:

The draft PEIS does not adequately discuss cumulative impacts, particularly with respect to cumulative impacts from this project to fisheries and water resources. The cumulative impact section must discuss the potential consequences of past, present and future actions that are likely to result from this proposal in greater detail, and must disclose the different impacts under a full range of alternatives.

Section 4.2.1 identifies cumulative issues. One issue is Recreation. But this issue is defined only in the context of increased access and usage of recreation-based facilities and properties, i.e. forests and parks. The issue is too narrowly defined and needs to be expanded to include the full range of cumulative impacts on non-structured recreational opportunities such as fishing, which occurs frequently along the I-70 Corridor, particularly in the Clear Creek, Blue River and Eagle River drainages. From a cumulative perspective impacts to fishery-based recreation, particularly when compiled with past losses, is substantial. It is a well known fact that original construction of I-70 has had substantial impacts on fish and fishery based recreation. Impacts to stream habitat, contamination of water from transportation based events, and loss of access have all negatively impacted the resource. Yet the definition of the recreation issue ignores all of these facts.

Many of these cumulative impacts to fisheries and water resources occur above any past, present or future growth and development. Yet the discussion of cumulative impacts continuously "passes the buck" and glosses over the real cumulative impacts from any I-70 project by obscuring them with the excuse that they would be overshadowed by induced growth and development in counties along the I-70 corridor. The most serious past, present and future impacts to the fisheries, water resources and Endangered Species occur on Public Lands and in reaches well above any past, present or potential future growth and development. To disregard cumulative impacts that can be attributed clearly to I-70, impacts which are severe, well documented and easily anticipated, is irresponsible and inconsistent with NEPA.

#### Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitment of Resources:

The National Environmental Policy Act requires that agencies present a discussion of Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitments of Resources, as well as a discussion of long term uses of man's environment versus short term productivity from natural resources. It isn't clear from a reading of this document that those issues were ever discussed or displayed. That appears to be a major discrepancy in this document and further points out the inadequacy of this document as an EIS. It presents a further argument as to why this document should be revised and reissued as a new draft EIS.

#### Lack of appropriate policy-level discussion of mitigation

One of the greatest shortcomings in the draft PEIS is the failure of CDOT to develop and commit to meaningful programs to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts of the proposal. Instead they have chosen to go forward with a shallow commitment to explore potential mitigation in the Tier 2 level of study. Such an approach is flawed from the beginning. If this draft PEIS is a policy level document designed to help CDOT/FHWA make a decision on a mode of transportation and a general configuration then it is unclear how they can do that without a detailed display of what policies will govern the mitigation scenarios for site specific mitigation.

CDOT squandered opportunities to develop meaningful mitigation strategies when it arbitrarily abandoned the SWEEP and ALIVE programs designed to address those issues. At public meetings at the Jefferson County Fairgrounds and at Frisco CDOT stated that these two programs "lost their way" and had to be deferred to Tier 2 level of analysis. Colorado Trout Unlimited was an active participant in both of those initiatives, and they certainly had not lost their way. We believe CDOT prematurely gave up on both of them because early results were identifying mitigation strategies that ran contrary to CDOT's preconceived ideas on what mitigation should (or should not) be.

NEPA requires federal agencies to make decisions based on, amongst other criteria, net environmental impact; those impacts remaining after the application of specified mitigation. CDOT's continuous use of qualifying statements that lead one to question whether any meaningful mitigation will ever be implemented are degrading to the NEPA process and prevent FHWA from identifying what the net impacts of the proposal will be.

As previously indicated Colorado TU believes that this document, as written, does not represent an adequate environmental impact statement. We believe that FHWA should consider the comments received in this review and commit to the release of a second draft document that will adequately quantify and disclose the environmental impacts that can be identified, develop mitigation policies for implementation in the Tier 2 level of studies, and offer a real comparison of alternatives in terms of those impacts and mitigation.

#### Inadequate Consideration of Costs used to Constrain Alternatives Analysis

The failure of the draft PEIS to fully disclose adverse environmental effects and address mitigation for unavoidable impacts is further aggravated by CDOT's apparent use of an arbitrary cost criterion to eliminate numerous alternatives from Tier 2 consideration. In looking at costs, the failure to include the full range of costs – including environmental and social costs – is a glaring omission. Even when looking only at financial costs, the failure to address mitigation needs artificially skews evaluation of alternatives against those alternatives that require less mitigation. This is not an insignificant factor; in some past EIS processes on which CTU has commented, the identified mitigation costs have been as great as those for project construction itself. Failing to include mitigation costs in the analysis leads to a fundamentally flawed evaluation and disclosure of costs.

#### Clean Water Act Compliance

CTU has significant questions about whether the draft PEIS can provide the information required to ensure compliance with the Clean Water Act. For example, will the State of Colorado be able to provide this project with the required 401 certification that water quality standards will be met?

In terms of 404 compliance, Corps guidance directs project sponsors to first avoid, then minimize, and finally to mitigate unavoidable adverse impacts. Agencies are to select the least damaging reasonable alternative. In this Draft PEIS the alternatives that have the least damage are those that are dismissed from further consideration, with cost again being the only criterion used to define "reasonableness". Further, as the draft PEIS provides (as discussed previously) inadequate disclosure of the environmental impacts of different alternatives and inadequate discussion of mitigation strategies under different alternatives – all meaningful analysis and discussion being deferred to Tier 2 – it is impossible to evaluate the alternatives in this context.

Additionally, the draft PEIS notes that the proposed project will disturb tailings including in a Superfund site (in Clear Creek County). The preferred alternatives are noted as having a greater impact based on their footprint than the more transit-based alternatives that are dismissed from Tier 2 consideration. It is not clear how CDOT or FHWA will meet anti-degradation requirements for water quality limited stream segments; it seems likely that compliance will significantly increase mitigation costs – further demonstrating the flaws in the cost analysis presented for the alternatives.

#### Specific Comments on impact determinations

The following comments refer to specific concerns embedded in the body of the draft PEIS:

Executive Summary, page ES-11 Discussion of costs of AGS system: The draft PEIS refers to the cost of the AGS system and identifies its costs as \$6.1 billion. The source of the cost estimate is not identified and appears too high. Was this value a number within a particular range or is it a fixed number based on a high level of engineering study? In either event the dollar cost of an alternative is only one factor in the decision making process and it is inappropriate to dismiss the alternative without a rigorous display of all decision factors.

Executive Summary, Page ES-14, Ability of Alternatives to Accommodate 2025 Travel Demand: Chart E-4 identifies how proposed alternatives meet 2025 Travel Demand. The currently "preferred" alternatives appear to be the worst performing in meeting 2025 travel demand. If this is the case then why were these alternative chosen, at the expense of the others, when some of the others far exceed the performance of the proposed alternatives? It must be noted that the identified life of construction is 15 years. If the project were started today it would end some time around 2020. Why would CDOT and FHWA use a metric that ties performance to a period of only 5 years beyond the completion of the project? It is further noted that all of the data and charts referring to ability to accommodate future travel demand appear to show superior performance in all the non-selected alternatives, except minimal action. If true then it appears that cost, and not environmental or social values, was the only determining factor in the selection of the proposed alternatives. It is highly troubling that the best alternatives to accommodate future travel demand were dismissed from further study, despite their ability to better

meet the stated Purpose and Need of the project (to increase capacity, improve accessibility and mobility, and decrease congestion).

Executive Summary, Page ES-15, Chart ES-6: The chart implies that non-selected alternatives have a greater useful life span than those selected as potentially preferred. It seems to us that if this is the case then those alternatives that have been dismissed should, in fact, be included in the subsequent analysis at the Tier 2 level and that their dismissal is inappropriate.

Executive Summary, Page ES-22, Areas of Safety Concern: The draft PEIS makes a statement that transit alternatives would be "slightly safer than the six lane highway 55 mph..." The EIS needs to better quantify the degree of improved safety and cite the studies used to determine these conclusions. In addition, CDOT makes its comparison on the anticipated number of fatalities likely to occur and ignores the effects of lost property damage and personal injury (as cited on page ES-22 of the draft PEIS). Why weren't all metrics compared? The EIS needs to be revised to show the differences in all metrics.

Executive Summary, Page ES-23, Cost Comparison: The section identifies costs of construction, maintenance and operations but totally ignores the costs of environmental mitigation. Subsequently the following section on environmental protection does not attempt to identify losses or "costs" to external values such as fisheries, cultural resources or other environmental parameters. The section strongly infers that Capital Costs, and Costs of Operations and Maintenance are the only costs factors that dominate the decisions CDOT has made to dismiss certain alternatives. This entire section needs to be revised to show total true costs of the proposed alternatives including human health costs, environmental externality costs and property loss costs. Mitigation costs, which can be substantial, must also be included.

Page 1-2, CDOT's Environmental Stewardship Ethic: The discussion of CDOT's environmental ethics is not supported by its environmental actions. Time and again through various technical committees CDOT has cast aside environmental concerns based on a perception that they are too expensive or that there is no funding. This happened in both the SWEEP and ALIVE processes and continues to threaten both the Straight Creek and Black Gore Creek SCAP's. An example of CDOT's belated and minimal action on environmental protection is the sedimentation problems in Black Gore Creek, near Vail, Colorado. Siltation from highway sanding operations has inundated the creek and severely impacted aquatic life. CDOT belatedly admitted there was a problem and finally accepted some responsibility for it. While admitting to some blame for the siltation, CDOT has consistently used funding as a reason for inaction in remediation of the creek. It has fallen to others to raise appropriate funds to resolve the problem and any future funding or commitment from CDOT is uncertain. Using these examples for proposed mitigation is very troubling and casts doubt on the stated mitigation strategies. This gives the environmental community cause for concern as to how CDOT will actually implement its "environmental ethic". For this and other reasons it is vital that CDOT specifically identify at a policy level how it will address avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of environmental impacts in a meaningful and detailed way in this programmatic EIS.

Section 1.5, Social Demand Issues, Page 1-4: The section identifies certain social demand issues that are "key to the understanding of the need for the proposed action." This section then proceeds to highlight the tremendous anticipated demand for travel by growth, recreation and tourism. Even as the population of the I-70 corridor is expected to double in the projected 20 years, this study further states that "Recreation trips (are) expected to meet or exceed population growth projections". Clearly capacity and longevity of any alternative is a very major consideration, if not the primary consideration and "need". However as we saw in the Executive Summary and highlighted above, CDOT has chosen alternatives that are least likely to meet these needs or to accommodate this anticipated growth and travel demand. These "preferred" alternatives also have some of the shortest life spans. These facts further reinforce the belief that capital and O&M costs were the only factors that went into alternative decision making.

Section 1.8.2, Capacity Deficiencies: The section attempts to identify drivers' expectations about the role of interstate highways; "that interstate highways offer (relatively) smooth traffic flow not affected by intersection controls such as stop signs or signals." This statement points out a major flaw in CDOT's thinking with respect to their mandate of providing transportation systems. The agency is still locked in a mentality of the 1950's where the solution to transportation problems is adding highways of ever-increasing numbers of lanes. CDOT has failed to embrace the full extent of its mission to implement transportation systems that use multiple technologies to address the diverse and changing transportation needs of its citizen constituents.

Chapter 2, Description and Comparison of Alternatives: CDOT has squandered an opportunity to introduce design technologies that would address potential and current destruction of valuable stream habitat. By committing to traditional cut and fill technology and avoiding elevated highway road beds CDOT has assured further significant environmental impacts to key streambeds in the project corridor. Interestingly the cross sections presented do allow for elevated roadbeds in Idaho Springs but they don't appear to adopt that same technology for stream crossings or in areas where the corridor becomes severely constricted. It is well known that I-70 has had devastating impacts to Clear Creek in some of the more narrow sections of the alignment. CTU believes that CDOT should aggressively investigate changing the design of the existing roadway to one that relieves existing and potential constrictions to Clear Creek and other streams in the corridor.

Section 3.3, Threatened and Endangered Species: The section inadequately and only minimally addresses legitimate concerns regarding an important species of cutthroat trout (as well as other TES). The Greenback Cutthroat trout is listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act and has been the focus of major recovery efforts by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Colorado Division of Wildlife, and other partners. FHWA will be required to conduct a consultation process under the ESA for the greenback cutthroat trout, and should do so at this programmatic (Tier 1) stage. Page 3-3 states "the effects of road construction would depend on the particular requirements of each construction project for portions of the Corridor and will be considered in the Tier 2 studies." Colorado TU believes this is an inappropriate approach to compliance with the ESA. The presence of endangered species must be a consideration in the decision process and selection or dismissal of any alternative. FHWA should actively pursue the consultation process it has initiated with the USFWS on the both species of cutthroat trout as a part of this Tier 1 PEIS. Biological Analyses and Biological Opinions will identify the likely impacts to these fish and whether they jeopardize the species. These decisions will determine which highway configuration(s) can be allowed to go forward. Consultation cannot be pushed down to Tier 2 Studies since a configuration is expected from this (inadequate) Tier 1 exercise.

In Section 3.3 CDOT acknowledges the presence of greenback cutthroat trout in Dry Gulch and in the main stem of Clear Creek as well as a link between these two populations. However, the draft PEIS does not adequately address whether, when and how these Cutthroat trout seasonally migrate between Dry Gulch and Clear Creek, nor does it remotely speculate how construction of any alternative, particularly the "preferred" alternatives will impact these fish. Dismissing alternatives that may have less impact on these populations without study and deferring any analysis to only the "preferred" alternatives in Tier 2 is inappropriate.

Section 3.3 further indicates that "Data on acreages of disturbances of the habitats of the Colorado River and greenback cutthroat trout are available on the Impact Data Tables in Appendix A." A review of Appendix A shows that no specific information is available and merely delays any analysis to Tier 2 studies. This is unacceptable.

The comment on Page 3.3-20 is also troubling. The last paragraph on the page reads "Investigative surveys of TES species habitats will be required as part of specific project development and this information be incorporated in project design to avoid affecting such species to the extent possible" (emphasis added). Statements such as this clearly summarize the concerns that CTU has with this entire project. First, consideration of endangered species must be incorporated into the decision matrix that FHWA will use to determine a "go-no go" decision. Second, CDOT cannot unilaterally determine what the "extent possible" is but must defer to the USFWS, under the consultation provisions of Section 7 of the ESA, as to whether the species is jeopardized and if so what alternative is reasonable and prudent. Throughout the discussion on endangered species CDOT has consistently used evasive terms with regard to endangered species protection. Use of terms like "to the extent possible" and "where possible" merely set the stage for CDOT to attempt to avoid any meaningful protection or mitigation.

Another comment on page 3.3-19, states "Habitat loss of TES species would be minimized by placing the new facilities (such as lanes or structures) in the right-of-way and avoiding rare habitats where possible." The next paragraph goes on to reference "critical areas" in Idaho Springs. CTU does not see what basis CDOT can offer for these kinds of statements absent any meaningful studies identifying how the endangered species are affected or not. To CTU's knowledge there are no "critical areas" for endangered species in Idaho Springs and this statement merely reinforces our belief that CDOT's analysis and consideration of the issues related to federal species protection responsibilities is lacking. Clearly FHWA must play a more active role.

Colorado TU believes that CDOT and FHWA must complete consultation on greenback cutthroat trout with the USFWS during Tier 1 studies. The draft PEIS should clearly identify impacts on endangered species, how CDOT/FHWA addresses those impacts to recovery efforts, and how they will participate in future recovery efforts and what resources they will commit to those efforts. No final decision on any alternative, mode of transportation or highway configuration should be made until these ESA considerations can be addressed.

Section 3.4, Water resources: Throughout the section CDOT acknowledges that impacts to water quality are likely and result from the inability to control both traction sanding and chemical deicers during periods of winter storms. In the mitigation section of the EIS CDOT continues to address these issues vaguely leaving no assurances that any meaningful action will be taken to stem the impacts of water quality impacts. CDOT defers a solution to the water quality problem as the development of Sediment Control Action Plans (SCAP). However, a review of a representative SCAP (Black Gore Creek) raises



some serious concerns. In the body of the SCAP it states that sediment control will improve from approximately 25% to 80%. However, the table in the SCAP as well as numerous other references identifies a best case scenario that will result in only 50% sand removal. Black Gore Creek is a particularly egregious situation and illustrates the problem with relying on current approaches. It is imperative that FHWA establish meaningful quantifiable standards for sediment capture and removal and identify a monitoring and reporting system that will assure compliance throughout the I-70 corridor. Traction sand impacts have long been an issue for CDOT. Application of sand has severely impacted the Blue and Eagle river systems. It is likely that similar impacts are occurring in the Clear Creek drainage although no definitive measurements have been taken. Colorado TU believes that these results constitute serious cumulative impacts for this project unrelated to "growth and development" and need to be addressed as such in this document.

Another distressing point with respect to mitigation of traction sand is a statement made in Table 3.4-26 Mitigation Summary. CDOT identifies mitigation for winter maintenance and storm water runoff as "CDOT Maintenance Procedures and construction BMP's, SCAP's for Black Gore Creek and Straight Creek; evaluation/implementation of "restoration" and water quality protection measures identified in the Clear Creek watershed (SWEEP);..." Unfortunately, CDOT's performance in Gore Creek, Straight Creek and Clear Creek has shown the inadequacy of these statements. Funding for these restoration activities in Black Gore Creek has never been a priority with CDOT and the work that has been done would never have happened without assistance from other entities. Continued external funding of this project is questionable. Also, CDOT never completed the studies on Clear Creek. The SWEEP program was arbitrarily abandoned in July 2002 before the Committee could make findings. FHWA must include meaningful and measurable standards in this PDEIS that will direct CDOT to aggressively resolve the traction sand issues. Finally, we are unable to identify what CDOT will do with respect to chemical deicers. In the draft PEIS, FHWA must develop a policy with respect to using deicer chemicals on I-70 and incorporate it into the PDEIS. To cite the SCAP's and SWEEP as primary means of impact mitigation for water resources, wetlands, riparian areas and fisheries is irresponsible and misleading.

Section 3.4, Water Resources, page 3.4-26, states that 12, 536 linear feet of stream disturbance will occur from the footprint of the six-lane highway 55 mph. This represents less of an impact than the AGS alternatives. A review of the document leads us to believe that this impact determination is not supportable in that it represents the inside dimensions of the footprint and only represents the disturbance of a completed facility. It doesn't appear to include the likely additional impacts from cut and fill requirements at the edges of the footprint nor does it appear to include the effects of construction. The EIS should be corrected to identify the true impact of the six-lane highway "footprint" on streams. The study states that retaining walls will likely be used if the fill slope exceeds 3:1. This 3:1 additional feet is not included in the six-lane highway footprint calculations, nor is an estimate of the tremendous costs that such extensive retaining wall construction will entail.

Section 3.5, Fisheries: The discussion in Section 3.5.3 and the Table 3.5-16 use the same logic that was employed in Table 3.4-26. The language under mitigation for Winter Maintenance and Storm Water runoff is virtually identical in both tables. This cookie cutter approach to mitigation shows a definite lack of thought into what would constitute adequate mitigation for fisheries and further reduces the credibility of CDOT to implement meaningful mitigation. FHWA should require CDOT to reconstitute the SWEEP program and develop an effective and fully funded plan for the entire I-70 corridor, deferring publication of any final document until a meaningful strategy for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating impacts is developed by CDOT with its stakeholders.

In Section 3.5.2.1 Direct Impacts, statements are made that the impacts resulting from the degradation of water quality, disturbance of habitat and trout spawning areas are limited to areas "immediately downstream from construction activities" and "Acres of disturbance in a 200-foot sensitivity area". The very nature of high gradient streams and their ability transport sediment means that these impacts will affect streams far beyond these limited zones of consideration. As an example, the high quality fishery of the Blue River and Gore Creek have been seriously degraded by current activities as far downstream as Green Mountain Reservoir and throughout Vail, beyond the 200' "sensitivity area". Traction sand is also moving from Black Gore Creek and Gore Creek into the Eagle River, well downstream of the SCAP limits, creating a situation that the proposed mitigation by application of the SCAP has inadequately dealt with.

Section 3.8, Impacts from Historic Mining activities: The Draft PEIS acknowledges the extensive difficulties that will be encountered for any alternative from historic mining activities, particularly in Clear Creek County. Section 3.8 discusses the impacts from the various groups of alternatives but does not attempt any comparison between the groups. The AGS system is noted as having the least impact due to the limited disturbance from pier excavation and from its smaller footprint. The comparison is limited only to other Transit alternatives and none is made with the Highway alternatives. Highway alternatives are stated to all have a similar impact between themselves. A limited comparison is then made and reflected in Table 3.8-8 that most Transit alternatives would have the least direct impact from historic mine waste material.

In light of the significant damage that has occurred and the potential for future damage due to I-70 activities from historic mine waste, this would have counted as a primary consideration for alternatives. That again does not seem to be the case, instead the cost of standard construction and operations and management seem to be the only real consideration. The costs of mine waste removal, transport and disposal could be considerable, yet are not included as part of the equation. The costs and impacts of potential acid and heavy metal discharge associated with highway activity are not considered or even mentioned for consideration at a later date (Tier 2).

Again, any meaningful analysis and study is deferred to Tier 2. It simply does not make sense to dismiss alternatives that are recognized as having the least direct impact from historic mine waste without any analysis of how substantial these impacts would be. There is no basis by which any real comparison between all the alternatives can be made. Given the lack of analysis and disclosure, dismissing alternatives on the basis of this draft PEIS appears to be arbitrary and wholly inappropriate.

Chapter 4, Cumulative Impact Analysis: The discussion under Cumulative Impacts does not rise to the standards of adequate disclosure under NEPA. Cumulative impacts are often considered as a discussion of the consequences of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions as a result of what the agency is proposing to do. Originally, construction of I-70 resulted in substantial impacts to natural resources, particularly fisheries, on Public Lands. Chapter 4 acknowledges that there were some impacts from original construction but does so in a qualitative way. Therefore, the impacts of original construction cannot be compared to currently proposed development. This doesn't provide for an understanding of the cumulative ramifications of this new development on an already impacted resource. FHWA should require that historic impacts be quantified, that they be compared to current likely impacts and displayed and contrasted to the total resource available. One example could be for the miles of stream bed likely to be impacted in Clear Creek. CDOT should identify what was impacted by the original construction of US 61/70. They should then identify what additional miles will be affected by the proposal. Finally those losses should be compared to the total miles of fishery habitat available in Clear Creek and a determination made if the additional impacts will render the stream void of a sustainable fishery.

The draft PEIS states, in the beginning of Chapter 4, that "Many of the cumulative issues are regional in nature, related to impacts from growth that may be induced beyond project projections and plans for the corridor region, as a result of the increased access and mobility opportunities of the PEIS transportation alternatives under evaluation." The chapter then attempts to dismiss most cumulative impacts as not the consequence of highway development. On page 4-1 the draft PEIS cites CEQ regulations that cumulative impacts "Result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions, Can result regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions; Can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time." Given those criteria it is difficult to see how CDOT rationalizes that the cumulative impacts will be the result of other forces in the region, especially since many truly severe impacts caused by I-70 have occurred and will occur on Public Land, far from any associated impacts caused by growth and development "beyond project projections". No development can or will occur along the headwater reaches of Black Gore Creek, Straight Creek or Clear Creek, and for nearly all of Ten Mile Creek, that could be in any way construed as an "additional" impact to any past, present or future I-70 project. This is all US Forest Service property, over which CDOT only controls an easement. Any past and future damage to water resources, wetlands, riparian areas and fisheries is CDOT's responsibility and must be addressed. This situation is grossly misrepresented in the draft PEIS and the inability of CDOT to address these important issues further indicates the inadequacy of this document and its rationale for choosing the "preferred alternatives". The EIS should acknowledge the likely reasonably foreseeable future impacts of highway development and not dwell on what the causal factors are that will bring them about. At this point in time the driving factors are highway development that is likely to result in significant social, cultural and environmental impacts to the region.

Other concerns:

In addition to the contents of the EIS Colorado CTU must express its disappointment in CDOT's failures during the planning phases of this project. There are a number of examples where they ignored the advice of their advisory committees and, in the case of SWEEP, simply terminated the process.

Failure to conduct meaningful public involvement:

During the recent planning cycle CDOT has held a number of public meetings and identified a few public-based committees to look at various aspects of planning. While CDOT's intentions may have been admirable their implementation has been woefully inadequate. In several instances, particularly in the SWEEP and ALVE programs, CDOT has not been willing to listen to participants or negotiate in good faith on areas of disagreement.

The SWEEP program is a meaningful example of the neglect on CDOT's part to listen to what its constituencies are saying. SWEEP was originally designed to allow stakeholders to develop programmatic levels of mitigation that would then drive site-specific mitigation in the second tier environmental review. The SWEEP program went on for more than two years but was eliminated

before recommendations could be developed.

Failure to include environmental values in the selection (or deletion) of alternatives

Throughout the draft PEIS it is apparent that CDOT has made its preliminary dismissal of potentially viable alternatives based on the single criterion of capital and O&M costs. In each of the sections describing alternative proposals there is an extensive discussion of the financial aspects of each proposal without any discussion of the values, or "costs" of losses to natural, cultural, or socio-economic resources or even of the financial costs of mitigation. There is little comparative analysis that would allow a display of the gains and losses of each alternative in comparison to their financial consequences. This approach to alternative selection has reduced CDOT's credibility to act on behalf of the FHWA in conducting an unbiased NEPA analysis that fairly compares and contrasts the tradeoffs that come with any alternative selection process. FHWA should require CDOT to conduct such an analysis and display its conclusions in the next version of the Draft PEIS.

CTU appreciates the chance to comment on this I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS. We look forward to continuing involvement with this process and hope that FHWA and CDOT will work together with local constituencies to create a solution to the problems and needs along the I-70 Corridor that will be beneficial to all Coloradans in the long run.

Categorized Comment	192	Nilsson, Ben	Public	2/16/2005	You folks must have to understand that the most urgent and probably the one area that would help solve the return mtn. trip traffic to Denver problems on the weekends and holidays is to do something to the section between Clear Creek Canyon and the tunnel east of Idaho Springs. This section of road is the major cause of the backup anytime there is lots of traffic returning from the mtns. This area has always been a problem and always will be until you find a way to get the speeds there up to 65. This area also causes problems west bound on ski weekends but nothing like the east bound trip. I have traveled this road for 50 years and this section has always been a problem. Why don't we address this first before moving to more exotic solutions for overall travel on I-70. Fixing this area would provide solutions now and then you would have more time for evaluating and working out an overall solution for the long term.	Online
Categorized Comment	373	Nottingham, Celeste	Public	2/16/2005	Hi, I'm Celeste Nottingham, and I'm a resident of Eagle County. Eagle County private developers are taking their own situation in their own hands whether anything or nothing at all happens on I-70. They're in their own best interests developing an easier way for people -- tourists, mostly -- to get in and out of Eagle County. And if they avoid DIA, so what?  But we know that the population is going to double there in about the next 20 years. We're expecting that. We're planning for it. I think I speak for a lot of people in Eagle County when I know that we have to have some high-speed mass transit, be it a monorail. Call it whatever that mode of transportation is. It's worked in other countries; we can here.  My personal feeling is that the alternatives that we were presented for that mode of transportation was perhaps not the one that would be the most cost-effective for us. And I also kind of have a feeling that our governor is not in favor of anything but making more highways. I know it's [INAUDIBLE DUE TO APPLAUSE] and I know he's a Republican. Unfortunately, it may change my whole view on everything.  I also think look at who's in charge of doing this project. The department of transportation. What's their business again? Oh, yeah, building highways. You know, enough said. We've got to be more futuristic. It's going to take people like you speaking to three to five other people and getting them engaged.  We've been at this a long time now, and something has to make a difference. I don't know if it's letters to the editors in all your local papers in Denver, but now's the moment.  Thanks.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	638	Environment Colorado	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/23/2005	Dear Cecilia,  Pasted below and attached is a letter from Environment Colorado regarding the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS. Please consider them formal comments on the draft. If you need me to fax or mail a hard copy as well, please let me know.  Sincerely, Elena  Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011  Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Ave Lakewood, CO 80228  May 23, 2005  Re: I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement  Dear Ms. Joy and Ms. Wallace,  Environment Colorado is a non-profit, non-partisan environmental advocacy organization dedicated to protecting Colorado's air, water, and open spaces. On behalf of our more than 20,000 members across the state, we are pleased to submit formal comments on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Draft PEIS). We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this draft.  We respectfully request that the Colorado Department of Transportation prepare a supplemental Draft PEIS, given the following conditions:  1. Full Disclosure of Significant Information: According to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), CDOT is required to conduct a supplemental PEIS if substantial changes in the proposed action are made or there are significant new circumstances or information that develop. In several instances there have been cases of incomplete information being distributed or information not being distributed to all relevant parties. (Please see the Sierra Club's detailed comments.)  2. Erroneous and Misleading Information: The draft PEIS' discussion of both impacts and mitigation strategies for the proposed alternatives is lacking. Without adequate detail about mitigation strategies, it is impossible for the public and other participants in the draft PEIS process to evaluate the alternatives.  3. Alternatives: Finally, we are concerned about the draft PEIS' treatment of the proposed alternatives and request CDOT to conduct a more thorough examination. Not only does the draft PEIS evaluate alternatives solely on the basis of economics (whereas NEPA calls for proper weight to be given to non cost factors), but the costs used for such an analysis are arbitrary and tend to over-estimate the cost of the rail alternatives while underestimating the costs of the highway expansion alternatives.  Bert Melcher, on behalf of the Rocky Mountain Chapter of the Sierra Club, has served as the representative of the conservation community on the Mountain Citizen Advisory Committee. The Sierra Club's formal comments address our concerns in more detail; please consider their addendum as comments on behalf of Environment Colorado as well.  In conclusion, Environment Colorado believes that the draft PEIS process should identify alternatives that allow Colorado to meet our transportation needs while promoting a sustainable environment and protecting our quality of life. We have serious concerns about the process undertaken for the draft PEIS and respectfully request that CDOT conduct a supplemental PEIS.  Sincerely,  Elena Nunez Administrative Director enunez@environmentcolorado.org	Email
Categorized Comment	542	Nyland, Fred	Public	5/23/2005	This plan will simply jam all of the population of the front range counties into a single highway into the mountains. Some improvements to I-70 are needed, but the wholesale tearing up of the countryside, especially through Clear Creek County. What is really needed is a network of widened highways to provide access to the mountains for all of the front range counties. Their population will be expanding and growing, probably to 6 to 8 million people in the next twenty years and one road is insufficient to handle the increased traffic. By the time your plan is completed and implemented, I-70 will still be a traffic mess the day it opens. Get a new plan which includes widening US 285 and US 24, and the construction of a new highway through Gilpin or Boulder county to provide access to the northern front range counties. Your plan does not meet the needs of Colorado's projected population and industrial growth.  Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Fred Nyland	Online

Categorized Comment	294	Nyland, Fred	Public	2/9/2005	Good evening, I am Fred Nyland. I'm a resident of Idaho Springs. I'm also a retired mathematician and policy analyst in the Washington, D.C. area.	Transcripts
					<p>I looked at this draft PEIS proposal to improve our environment and I found it really elegant, slick as hell, and entirely narrow minded. It's -- and I thought about it, and I said there's something drastically wrong with it. The I-70 corridor is extended from Weld County to El Paso County. There's going to be 8 million people living in that district by the time we get this road finished. So it occurred to me that, rather than a single highway for all these people funneling up through the mountains, that we should have more than one, preferably three or four, and I want to go over just some of the considerations that led me to this conclusion.</p> <p>One was the study of the population. I-70 was envisioned and property began to be condemned and acquired in 1958. The population of Colorado in 1950 was about one and a half million people. The census data that I have indicates it is a little over 4 million today. And they all -- of that, 80 percent live in what I call the Front Range counties that extend from Ft. Collins to Colorado Springs. And we are expected to have all of those people use our one highway.</p> <p>Now, it occurs to me that there are other alternatives when you look at the breadth of that corridor. Some of them have been mentioned right now. But one thing I wanted to comment about is that during the -- during the construction period of this, we don't see any pictures of how nice it will look.</p> <p>I happen to have been at the photometric -- national photometric exposition in Rolla, Missouri, at the time of the construction of I-70 in the Mount Vernon Canyon. And I asked the people, Where is that? That's a combat zone. He said, No, we took the pictures because we thought it was like a combat zone. We've perfected some new technology in our aerial photography. And it was hysterical. It looked terrible. And it scared me, even though I was in Missouri. But I had grown up in this state, and I had been gone for quite a while.</p> <p>Now, all these people are moving into Colorado. When I look back at the time the design was made of this, I think the only -- yeah, the only ski area in Summit County -- the only ski area was A Basin. We had Winter Park. In the time that I was gone from Colorado, we got a whole array and guess where they were? They were along the highway that existed, I-70. If we were to build other highways in other directions, I'm sure we would have other world-class resorts and other very favorable developments.</p> <p>Now, when -- what I'm proposing is the need for a network of transportation. It's difficult sometimes for highway people to think about transportation problems as a whole. It turns out that it will probably be a highway network. And what I'm suggesting -- I'm not a highway engineer, but what we need is something like 285 from Colorado Springs. We had a number of my friends give up skiing at Winter Park because it's too congested on I-70. So then, the 285 solution looks fairly reasonable. Maybe we should have a four or six-lane highway. It would make quick access to the southern part of Summit County.</p> <p>The other thing that's sorely needed is a route up through Boulder or Gilpin County with a tunnel through the mountain into Grant County and Steamboat Springs. That would promote commercial traffic through that part rather than having every semi truck in Colorado going up our highway. And, with that, I will stop.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
Categorized Comment	251	Nyland, Fred	Public	2/3/2005	<p>Post Office Box 1674 Idaho Springs, CO 80452</p> <p>February 3, 2005</p> <p>Ms. Cecilia Joy Colorado Department of Transportation 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Re: I-70 Mountain Corridor</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to comment on your proposed "improvement" options for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. While your draft PEIS is elegant in presentation, lengthy in providing many details, and slick as possible in the advertising world, its focus is far too narrow. As is usual with many government agencies, the real problem is set aside in favor of zeroing in on the part that can be handled by standard engineering practices -- in this case, simply widening a highway. Any vision statement about the future should provide idealistic concepts without any financial constraints. If the new ideas have merit, then those organizations who may provide funding will begin to express a high level of interest. The concepts should come first, and funding would follow. Vision statements should provide the reader a broad glimpse of the future without being lettered by an arbitrary in-house view of monetary limits. In the remaining portion of this letter I have tried to outline the extent of the real problem and suggest some solutions that go far beyond simple highway widening.</p> <p>The real need for the residents of Colorado is a transportation network. Some issues that deserve consideration are Colorado population growth, where the potential transportation users reside, the real extent of the I-70 corridor, and easing traffic congestions headed for the mountains and their world class resorts. It seems obvious that your set of solutions to improving traffic flow into and away from the mountains is to merge everything into a single highway, that portion of the interstate highway, I-70, west of C-470 to Glenwood Springs. The more pressing needs are other routes in addition to I-70 for providing year round access to the mountain areas of Colorado. Since I am not a highway engineer, I can only suggest potential locations for additional routes. With the population growth, growth in the transport and tourism industries, and growth in business ventures and high technology companies, more road systems will be needed to provide access to western parts of Colorado by all of the people and industries which now are concentrated in front range counties. At the conclusion of this letter, a few suggestions will be offered.</p> <p>Population Growth</p> <p>Many of the users of I-70 are Colorado residents who go to the mountains on day trips and longer stays. The population of Colorado has grown considerably since I-70 was first designed. The first property acquisitions for the I-70 right of way were progressing in the late 1950's. Thus, the route for I-70 and its design were well known by 1960. Since that time, Colorado population growth has increased by a factor of 2.5, as shown in Figure 1. In addition, the counties that constitute the bulk of Colorado's population are along the front range. In 1960, these counties accounted for 60% of the population. By the year 2000, this fraction had grown to 80%. These data are taken from the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The projected growth is shown in the figure by the dashed lines is based on exponential extrapolation amounting to a population of about 8 million people by the year 2030. If linear extrapolation is used, the population of Colorado would be over 6 million people, most of them living in the front range counties. Thus, the population of Colorado is projected to increase by 50% to 100% during the proposed reconstruction of I-70. Will a single widened highway handle the increased traffic?</p> <p>The I-70 Corridor</p> <p>Where do all these residents of the front range counties live? They live in what should be properly called the "I-70 Corridor." The I-70 corridor as defined by the Department of Transportation is obviously a narrow strip of land a few miles wide along the present right of way, and is not related to the sources of overall highway use by residents of the front range counties. Figure 2 shows the geographic distribution of the population of what are termed the front range counties. These counties include Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Broomfield, Denver, Douglas, Elbert, El Paso, Jefferson, Larimer, and Weld counties. From this map, it is obvious that the only major east-west highway is I-70. I-25 provides the feeder routes for people living north and south of Denver. The Department of Transportation draft PEIS notes that I-70 is the major route for visitors to world class resorts. In addition, commercial traffic, and out of state visitors add to the traffic flow going to these destinations.</p> <p>In the broader perspective, the I-70 corridor extends from Colorado Springs on the south, to Ft. Collins on the north. If one merely accepts the narrow vision of the Department of Transportation, then their activities may help to momentarily ease traffic congestions along I-70. However, this narrow view of the problem overlooks the true extent of the larger and more important problem: providing access to and through the mountains for the majority of the Colorado population, the commercial transportation industry, and visitors.</p> <p>Easing Congestion</p> <p>Will "fixing up" I-70 cure the overall congestion problems that presently exist? For the following reasons, the answer is probably not. The population of Colorado has increased dramatically in the past forty years, and growth will continue to flood I-70. Most likely, the I-70 Interstate Highway will be saturated the day it opens after the improvements proposed by the Department of Transportation have been completed. More and more people are moving to Colorado. They desire to be near our mountains for recreational purposes, and Colorado now enjoys major economic growth in many industrial areas. For example, in 1960, there was no Hewlett Packard, no Kodak, only a small Martin Company, and a very small Ball Corporation in Colorado. The growth in the Colorado Springs area has grown immensely during the past forty years, much of it due to the increased military presence in El Paso county. Douglas county in 1960 was very rural. Now it is the one of the fastest growing counties in the United States. High technology companies have moved and are still moving to Colorado. The aerospace industry has blossomed, and investment activities abound. Companies easily attract new employees because of the access to outdoor activities and the mountains.</p> <p>The time to perform the improvements to I-70 proposed by the Colorado Department of Transportation</p>	Written

will be at least 10 to 20 years. During this period, the population of Colorado will be increasing, as estimates in Figure 1 show. In all probability, the mountain section of an improved I-70 will be saturated by the time the highway reopens. These conditions have prevailed in the past in southern California. Once a new freeway is planned, housing, shopping malls, and other facilities begin to appear along the new route even though it is still under construction. When the new freeway opens, it is full of cars within a few days. Similarly, Colorado has experienced the same growth conditions. There were objections when C-470 was planned. When a large portion was completed around the western and southern fringes of metropolitan Denver between I-70 and I-25, the traffic was not particularly heavy at first. Within a year adjoining areas of Jefferson, Arapahoe, and Douglas counties were booming, and commuters filled C-470. Now, rush hour traffic along C-470 is very crowded. This process did not take long to emerge and grow.

#### Construction Impact

A further problem related to the time to "improve" I-70 cannot be overlooked. What will the traffic be like during the period of construction? How long will construction last? First, the construction process for improving I-70 will look like a combat zone. Stereographic aerial photographs of the original construction phase of I-70 through Mt. Vernon canyon resembled a war zone, complete with craters and enormous amounts of earth being moved around. Department of Transportation presentation materials presently available show what the end results of their various options would look like. They look neat and orderly, even though they may turn out to be inadequate. So far, there seem to be no presentation materials or graphics showing what I-70 will look like during the construction period. The impact of widening I-70 will be extensive, and most certainly, much more than simply inconvenient.

Where will the people going to the mountains be travelling during such "improvements"? Plans for handling traffic during reconstruction of the mountain section of I-70 are not at all clear. Clear Creek county and its towns will face enormous traffic flows along narrow detours. Some of the detours will obviously go right through the towns, adding to congestion problems that are presently bulging when weekend travelers abound. The impact on the local economies will be drastic, and in some cases, will result in at least some business failures or unwanted and undesired relocations. Sunday night traffic in Idaho Springs at the present time is most unpleasant, since even service roads are overcrowded. Will such inconveniences grow without limit during construction?

#### Need for a network

It seems clear that with the growth of population in Colorado, there is a need for a transportation network. Under the present plans of the Department of Transportation, travel to the mountains will be funneled into a single east-west highway. There is only one all season access road through the mountains north of I-70, up Poudre Canyon. There are no major east west highways north of I-70 within Colorado. South of I-70 there is no major interstate highway in Colorado.

Within Colorado, there are some existing east-west highways that could be widened to provide access to the mountains that would relieve traffic congestion far more than simply widening I-70. These potential routes would include US 285, and US 24. Both of these routes could provide access to Summit and Eagle counties. A new road, and tunnel, could be built to access Grand county. Such a road might follow the present railroad route with an adjacent bore near the Moffat Tunnel. Other possibilities do exist. A northern access to Grand county through Gilpin or Boulder county could further extend along the western part of US 40 to the northwestern area of Colorado. Such a route should be attractive to commercial as well as tourist traffic and would provide connections to the present interstate highway system within the state. Alternate routes similar to those suggested here should be part of an overall plan to provide a transportation network for the future. Simply focussing on funneling traffic from all of the front range counties through a single highway is a less than adequate plan for accommodating a robust growth in population.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on your future highway plans for Colorado. If you have any questions, or wish to discuss these issues further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Frederic S. Nyland

Mr. Nyland is a retired policy analyst and mathematician. His professional experience spans the years from 1950 to 2002. After serving in the U.S. Army, he was a Field Engineer for RCA. When the Martin Company moved to Denver, Fred was a Design Specialist on the Titan I intercontinental ballistic missile. He was employed as a Senior Mathematician at the Rand Corporation for 21 years, and served as their Director of National Security Research. After his return to Colorado, Mr. Nyland was a Program Manager for the Lockheed Martin Corporation. Subsequent to his retirement, he served for twelve years as an Expert Consultant to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the U.S. Department of State.

Categorized Comment	286	Olnhausen, Sandy and Lou	Public	12/22/2004	12/22/04	Written
					<p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager CDOT, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Ave Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Re: Comments on the proposed I-70 corridor.</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy,</p> <p>My wife and I have met you and Mr. Pinkerton over the years at the CDOT hearings. We favor the proposed widening as presented by CDOT.</p> <p>We have enclosed several letters sent to the editor of the Courant and the Clear Creek County Commissioners that reflect our position on this subject.</p> <p>If you have questions or need further information please let us know.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Sandy and Lou Olnhausen PO Box 142 Dumont, CO 80436 Phone 303 567 4085 AZ phone 480 288 2596</p> <p>Attachments</p> <p>P.S. Please add the attached article to the I-70 Corridor comments. The Clear Creek Courant finally published it on our 3rd submittal!</p> <p>Monorail may not be best solution for interstate 70</p> <p>Editor: In response to I-70 Task Force plans to move forward to block CDOT highway widening in Clear Creek County in spite of the failed ballot issue:</p> <p>Their bottom line solution to widening appears to be going back to the monorail. I have read two articles from January 2004, one in the Arizona Republic outlining abandoned monorail attempts in China and Japan along some of the heaviest populated corridors on earth.</p> <p>Our I-70 corridor population pales in comparison. Even if the cost of monorail vs. widening were equal, who would ride it? To my knowledge, no one has done a comprehensive study on the potential cost to, or the number of riders that will ultimately pay for this system. We do know very few workers commute along this corridor. Will a camper, boater, ATV or snowmobiler, hunter, fisherman, hiker, backpacker, etc., abandon pricey recreation toys to use the monorail? Has anyone asked what happens if we build the monorail and we still have gridlock?</p> <p>I am aware the commissioners side with the Task Force but I would ask them to consider another point of view before continuing to pursue a dream who's time may not have yet arrived.</p> <p>Sandy Olnhausen Dumont</p>	
Categorized Comment	461	Olnhausen, Sandy and Lou	Public	4/4/2005	4/4/05	Written
					<p>To: Cecelia Joy</p> <p>RE: Comments on Proposed I-70 Corridor</p> <p>Vox Pop Clear Creek Courant Alternative Routes to I-70 Or Facing Reality</p> <p>After reading the articles (see attached) on possible alternative routes to easing traffic along I-70 by going northwest under Rollins Pass or southwest along the 285 corridor, it occurred to me why the highway department chose I-70 in the first place. Due to the fierce terrain, it was the only logical choice that provided the shortest distance between eastern and western Colorado at the lowest cost to</p>	

					taxpayers.	
					High-speed transit is not the solution. Ask the proponents why China, Japan and Germany abandoned their projects? Especially because of our rugged terrain, the untested technology, the high costs to build, operate and ride, makes it totally unfeasible. More importantly, even with the high cost of gas would we ever abandon our beloved auto, SUV, RV, pickup or boat to ride a train to our favorite recreation destination?	
					Because they couldn't move or bypass Denver, T-Rex happened and the people survived. Because we can't move or bypass our county we must get out of denial and face up to the reality and inevitability of a wider I-70 through Clear Creek County.	
					There is still an out. You have the great American privilege to move if you so choose.	
					Sandy Olmhausen P.O. Box 142 Dumont 80436	
Categorized Comment	267	O'Malley, Kevin	Counties	2/2/2005	Somehow I knew you'd call me up to talk right after Ed. Excuse me. My name is Kevin O'Malley. I'm a county commissioner for Clear Creek County. And I want to talk about really three issues here. It should be very easy to do that in less than five minutes.	Transcripts
					The first subject I'd like to talk about is Clear Creek County's perspective about this issue, because I expect, as this goes through its process, you will hear -- and this is primarily for folks down here in the metro area and not so much in the mountain corridor, but you will hear about Clear Creek County as being an obstructionist. And you will hear about, you know, Clear Creek County being those mountain people that just want to go back to 1870 and mine silver and gold. And I want to give you a little bit more realistic idea about Clear Creek County.	
					We understand that the I-70 corridor is extremely important to the economic viability of both the Front Range and the Western Slope. We also understand that there will be some changes along the I-70 corridor. So we are not just trying to stop this process. We understand that it needs to happen. We also believe that it needs to be done correctly, that you only get one chance to do that. And a lot more thought needs to go into it than what has gone into it so far.	
					The second thing that I would like to talk about is the 15-year period from 2010 to 2025. It is not addressed at all in the PEIS as set forth -- and thank you for having this right next to me. This little graph projects a very tiny drop in economic activity in these nine counties while this construction period is going on.	
					Now, you know, they have a model, so I guess you have to use the models, but this projects that over a 35-year period the Colorado economy is going to kind of grow on a regular basis. Now, Colorado was founded in 1876. I pretty much guarantee there hasn't been 35 years of a steady economic period in that entire time.	
					They estimated that this little dip here -- well, that little dip, as it's been told to me -- and because it was told to me by Ed, so I tend to rely on what he says -- that little dip represents \$15 billion in lost economic activity. That is from the ski areas, that's to Clear Creek County, that's to the entire Western Slope. \$15 billion.	
					The traffic congestion, and I want you all to -- I only have about a minute and a half left here. I want you to paint a picture here as you drive up through Clear Creek County along the entire stretches of the highway. On one side you have a sheer mountain, on the other side, it looks like you might have a little bit of room to do some expansion.	
					But the truth is, right on the other side of the highway is Clear Creek. So if they're going to tear up the highway and if they're going to shave those mountains, there's no way in the world that they can do it without shutting down the highway or big parts of it. So we'll spend 15 years where every day will be like Sunday afternoon or Saturday morning.	
					I've only got 30 seconds left here, so I will get to the answer. One other thing I have to talk about, Idaho Springs -- an elevated area of Idaho Springs. How do you build an elevated area over a highway and still keep the highway underneath it opened? You don't. So that entire area will be two lanes, one in each direction.	
					I'm supposed to stop now. But the answer is build the monorail first, then fix the highway. And the money, they didn't think that there was money for FasTracks. The people in the metro area said, We have the money.	
					Thank you.	
Categorized Comment	151	O'Malley, Kevin	Counties	1/12/2005	My name's Kevin O'Malley. I'm one of the county commissioners in Clear Creek County. I hate to follow Randy Wheelock when he speaks because he always seems smarter than I am.	Transcripts
					Because I'm not like most of the people who will be impacted by this project, I am not very technically astute, so I've tried to bring these issues down to the things that are a little more understandable to the layman like myself. So I have here some reasons. First, why I-70 widening without transit is a bad idea, and then some reasons why a fixed guideway is a good idea.	
					And as far as the bad idea, without an alternative, one of Colorado's most valuable historical areas will irreparably be damaged. Increased traffic and the use of more chemical deicers will further pollute Colorado's air and water. Construction will disturb toxic mine tailings and pollute one of the metro area's main water sources, Clear Creek. The highway will be obsolete, by our reckoning, when it is finished.	
					Parking is already a problem in resort areas. Where will the cars go once they get there? I found a single paragraph in this 13- to 15- 3,000-page document which addressed that, and that single paragraph says: CDOT assumes local infrastructure will keep up. Where's the money going to come from?	
					The Western Slope tourism economy will be put in significant jeopardy. Every afternoon on I-70 will be like Sunday afternoon today. Every morning will be like Saturday morning. A 15-year traffic nightmare with no alternate route. And to steal words from Dennis Lundberry, the mayor of Idaho Springs, "All pain, no gain."	
					Why is the fixed guideway a good idea? Because the guideway's commercial revenue potential is the transmission line for the utilities; the issues during and after construction will be minimized; the AGS transit system will lead to concentrated planned commercial and residential development in close proximity to stations rather than urban sprawl throughout the I-70 corridor; the AGS transit system can be used to haul freight; the system will not be obsolete the day it opens; and AGS transit system can last 50 years, while the highway needs to be resurfaced every six to eight years -- I'll be done in a second -- any necessary highway improvements to be made after the transit alternative is complete; impact on the current highway can be minimized; the project can be completed in five years instead of 15. Less pain; more gain.	
Categorized Comment	242	Opferman, Dennis	Public	2/28/2005	Dear Folks: Having just looked at the Draft PEIS, I am appalled by the lack of a recommendation for rail service. It would take a monumental amount of time to study the assumptions and methodology that went into this study, in order to properly criticize the results. However, that is neither practical nor necessary. I am a native of Pueblo, and grew up in the great state of Colorado and want to see its natural beauty, air quality and standard of living maintained and/or improved. Widening I-70 will not do this. In fact, it will accelerate the denigration of all of the above. An environmentally friendly, unobtrusive rail line is the common sense answer to the increased travel demands in this corridor. I urge you to adopt this as a PREFERRED option. To do otherwise, is totally irresponsible. Sincerely, Dennis C. Opferman	Online
Categorized Comment	499	Ortiz, Claire	Public	5/15/2005	I am shocked at the lack of consideration the impact of the proposed construction on the surrounding communities is being given in the decision making process.  This could be a real disaster. Let's face up to that fact before the decision is made and we are living with it!  I support the elevated rail option.	Online
Categorized Comment	260	Oster, Daryl	Public	3/3/2005	Evacuated Tube Transport (ETT) is a new transportation technology that may be built using existing processes for less than a tenth the cost of the high speed rail alternative for the proposed I-70 improvement west of Denver. The ETT system capitalizes on the latest development low cost MagLev (FTSM) that was developed in Chengdu China (not the very expensive German maglev technology built in Shanghai China).	Online

The ETT technology eliminates virtually all friction, so ETT uses less than 1/50th as much energy and causes less than 1/50th as much pollution as cars, planes or trains. ETT is also immune to bad weather – 5 feet of snow would have no effect on operation.

The ETT vehicles are about the same interior volume as luxury sedan, or SUV and will be capable of exceeding 200mph on most of the I-70 alignment. While the ETT vehicles are roomier than most cars, they are much lighter because the motor and drive components are not in the vehicle, so the weight is less than 400lbs, (or less than 1/10 the curb weight of a SUV).

The ETT system operates like a freeway instead of like a railroad – all access points are off-line, so the flow of the automated ETT vehicles are not interrupted if one makes a stop. Since ETT is automated, the capacity is much higher than highways or train tracks. The capacity of ETT exceeds the capacity of 10 lanes of freeway.

ETT is so low in cost to build and operate that it can make money AND be lower cost than driving a car. This fact will enable private funding of ETT requiring no subsidy from taxpayers. Visit [www.et3.com](http://www.et3.com) to learn more about ETT.

Daryl Oster

(c) 2004 all rights reserved. ETT, et3, MoPod, "space travel on earth" e-tube, e-tubes, and the logos thereof are trademarks and or service marks of et3.com Inc. For licensing information contact: [et3@et3.com](mailto:et3@et3.com), [www.et3.com](http://www.et3.com) POB 1423, Crystal River FL 34423-1423 (352)257-1310

Categorized Comment	518	Owens, David	Public	5/19/2005	<p>In my opinion, there is one thing that is MOST important to do to alleviate the traffic backups on I-70 between Denver and Frisco. That is to STRAIGHTEN OUT THE CURVES between exits 241 and 244 in the Hidden Valley area!</p> <p>For long term improvement, I think that I-70 needs to be widened to 6 lanes from Floyd Hill to Frisco. I drive that section of highway very often and that is where the traffic backups seem to occur with great regularity, especially westbound on Friday afternoon/evenings and eastbound on Sunday afternoon/evenings.</p> <p>I believe that if I-70 is widened, there should be space allotted for future mass transit options. And I also believe that if the highway is widened, care should be taken between Idaho Springs and Silver Plume to preserve the quality of life in those towns and not unduly impose upon the space that remains in those locations.</p> <p>Also, I believe that if the highway is widened, wildlife crossings (either under or over the highway) should be provided at appropriate locations.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	581	Owens, David	Public	2/23/2005	<p>In my opinion, there is one thing that is MOST important to do to alleviate the traffic backups on I-70 between Denver and Frisco. That is to STRAIGHTEN OUT THE CURVES between exits 241 and 244 in the Hidden Valley area!</p> <p>For long term improvement, I think that I-70 needs to be widened to 6 lanes from Floyd Hill to Frisco. I drive that section of highway very often and that is where the traffic backups seem to occur with great regularity, especially westbound on Friday afternoon/evenings and eastbound on Sunday afternoon/evenings.</p> <p>I believe that if I-70 is widened, there should be space allotted for future mass transit options. And I also believe that if the highway is widened, care should be taken between Idaho Springs and Silver Plume to preserve that quality of life in those towns and not unduly impose upon the space that remains in those locations.</p> <p>Also, I believe that if the highway is widened, wildlife crossings (either under or over the highway) should be provided at appropriate locations.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	395	Paccagnan, Steve	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/23/2005	<p>Hi, I'm Steve Paccagnan, I'm the general manager for Copper Mountain Resort.</p> <p>Along with our partners in tourism, we support CDOT in the alternative to widen the highway as well as the preservation of land for consideration towards high-speed rail or some sort of a rail transportation.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	635	Copper Mountain Resort	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	<p>May 24, 2005</p> <p>Cecilia Joy Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011 <a href="mailto:Cecilia.joy@dot.state.co.us">Cecilia.joy@dot.state.co.us</a></p> <p>Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80226 <a href="mailto:Jean.Wallace@fhwa.dot.gov">Jean.Wallace@fhwa.dot.gov</a></p> <p>Dear Cecilia and Jean:</p> <p>As the Vice-President and General Manager of Copper Mountain Resort, I thank you for this opportunity to add my comments to the many you have received regarding the I-70 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS).</p> <p>As you are aware Copper Mountain is owned and operated by Intrawest Colorado. Intrawest Colorado also operates Winter Park Resort and has other interests in the Colorado High Country. We are also represented by Colorado Ski Country USA (CSCUSA), a the trade association representing 24 Colorado ski resorts, several of which along with Copper Mountain and Winter Park rely on the I-70 Mountain Corridor for resort access for both day and destination skiers. As a member of CSCUSA we have been actively involved in discussions with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for more than seven years on the need for improvements to the I-70 Mountain Corridor. Through CSCUSA we have participated in the Steering Committee for the Major Investment Study (MIS) that was conducted on the corridor and has been involved in the Mountain Corridor Advisory Committee (MCAC) and the Finance Committee for the effort currently underway on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). We appreciate the extensive public and stakeholder outreach that has been the hallmark of the PEIS preparation team.</p> <p>CSCUSA has represented us well over the course of the PEIS and Copper Mountain endorses the course of action identified by the association.</p> <p>While the process of engaging with stakeholders along the I-70 Mountain Corridor has been a lengthy and arduous one, Copper Mountain commends CDOT and FHWA for their fortitude and, more importantly, for the extensive and thorough analysis that is included in the PEIS. Copper Mountain appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft PEIS.</p> <p>The following statements compiled by CSCUSA have been adopted by Copper Mountain and are worth reiterating.</p> <p>Ski Industry Trends</p> <p>The Draft PEIS projects that skier visits at resorts along the I-70 Mountain Corridor will increase by 13 percent between 2000 and 2025. The PEIS also states that data from CSCUSA is among the data used to make this projection. While CSCUSA realizes that part of CDOT and FHWA's task is to model future traffic demand, CSCUSA's data on past skier visits is not an accurate predictor of future skier visits on the micro scale set forth in the demand model.</p> <p>CSCUSA does not have a crystal ball, but we do know that the recent decline in destination skier visits has been nearly reversed, with international visitors being a particularly strong component of the reversal. Additionally, Front Range skiers make up approximately 40 percent of annual skier visits in Colorado. With continued population growth projected for the Front Range, CSCUSA expects that the Front Range will continue to attract younger participants into the sport of skiing. Front Range guests are a sophisticated market—price sensitive, snow sensitive and traffic sensitive. The wide availability of low-priced season pass products is expected to continue and, in years with good snowfall, Front Range skiers will ski more than they will in drier years. Nearly all of these skiers are I-70 users.</p> <p>The Front Range skier, armed with an affordable season pass, has changed his/her travel behavior as much as the I-70 mountain corridor will allow over the last several years. The season pass holder,</p>	Email

having invested in the cost of a season pass, is now more inclined to leave the Front Range very early in the morning on a weekend day and return earlier in the day or return after the resorts have closed to avoid peak traffic. In addition, while the day skier market continues to be strong, we have seen a substantial increase in the Colorado overnight category with Front Range skiers taking more overnight trips in each of the last several years, at least in part because of I-70 congestion. These behaviors have caused a spreading out of the peak demand times on the corridor on winter weekends. The season pass holder will ski more some years and less in others, depending on snow quality and abundance, perception of hassles on I-70, the weather in Denver and other variables. However, a day skier from the Front Range who buys a lift ticket for a single day is more likely to ski a longer day, returning home after resorts have closed for the day.

To the extent that the PEIS discusses the need to change travel behavior and suggests the possibility of "alternate recreation schedules" as ways to address congestion issues on the corridor, CSCUSA urges CDOT and FHWA to recognize that, with regard to winter schedules in particular, there is not additional opportunity for changes in travel behavior or alternate recreation schedules for skiers. Ski resorts are up and running during winter daylight hours, normally 9 am to 3 or 4 pm, depending on the time of season. Efforts to change behavior will not be able to alter the length of a ski day or the interest of the skier in skiing enough of a ski day to feel as though he or she got his or her money's worth that day. Ski resorts have offered incentives to skiers to purchase passes for use during off-peak times that exclude weekends. These products are well received by the limited number of individuals who are not tied to work and school obligations Monday through Friday. CSCUSA does not foresee fundamental changes in work and school schedules that would allow alternate recreation schedules in the winter months.

Access to skiing and to other mountain recreation opportunities is a quality of life issue for Coloradans, an economic development issue for Colorado, especially the Front Range, and an economic impact issue for the entire state. Colorado ski resorts compete for skiers in a global marketplace and I-70 currently represents at a minimum a challenge and for many an obstacle to choosing to vacation in Colorado. Annual skier spending in Colorado totals approximately \$2.5 billion. A majority of that total is generated along the I-70 mountain corridor. We can say with certainty that this number would be higher without the current competitive disadvantage presented by I-70 relative to other destinations.

What's the alternative?

The PEIS details the need for improvements to the I-70 corridor—increased capacity, improved accessibility and mobility, and decreased congestion. The "no action" and "minimal action" alternatives considered in the PEIS do not serve the need on the corridor and should be discarded from further consideration.

The I-70 mountain corridor desperately needs capacity improvements in the near-term and a long-term vision to address future anticipated growth. CSCUSA supports continued efforts by CDOT and FHWA to address the underlying need while providing for and accommodating sensitivity to the environment, respect for community values, improvements to corridor safety and an implementable approach. The current congestion on the corridor frustrates travelers and poses continuing air quality challenges, as vehicles stuck in traffic idle on I-70 for hours during peak periods.

CSCUSA supports the addition of an additional highway lane both eastbound and westbound between Floyd Hill and the Eisenhower Tunnel, including a third bore to add capacity to the Eisenhower and Twin Tunnels. In addition, CSCUSA supports preserving the corridor for future transit. Consistent with the I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition, CSCUSA believes that currently there is neither the technology nor knowledge about transit in a mountain corridor to implement such a transit system. We also agree that it is time to begin research and planning for corridor transit in the future.

This alternative will provide for much needed capacity improvements within the 20-year time horizon that have a reasonable chance of being fundable with anticipated monies. It recognizes the longer-term growth anticipated along the corridor and allows for deliberate planning for such growth, both in terms of mobility and fiscal responsibility.

Sequencing

The I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition has commented at length about its preferred sequencing of capacity improvements to the corridor, with a particular preference to perform improvements in the Idaho Springs area last. While CSCUSA is respectful of the Coalition and its preferred approach, CSCUSA would urge that CDOT and FHWA bring their considerable expertise to bear on the issue of sequencing and determine the sequencing of improvements between Floyd Hill and the Eisenhower Tunnels that will optimize mobility and mitigate congestion. The addition of capacity to the entire stretch between Floyd Hill and the Eisenhower Tunnels, while leaving Idaho Springs unimproved until the end of the process will simply result in a bottleneck at Idaho Springs.

Construction Impacts

CSCUSA agrees with the I-70 Corridor Coalition that further analysis of corridor mobility during the construction period of the selected alternative should be considered and set forth in the Final PEIS. The draft assumes that alternatives will be completed by 2025 with evaluations on how well they meet estimated 2025 travel demand. Construction mobility restrictions and related impacts should be identified and evaluated, so that corridor stakeholders and visitors can plan accordingly. Special controls during construction should be considered, including off-peak controls or incentives for trucks and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes.

Additionally, CSCUSA believes that a 15-year projected construction period is too long. Every effort should be brought to bear to compress the timeframe during which this vital economic lifeline is under construction. CDOT has successfully compressed the Southeast Corridor or "T-REX" project into a 6-8-year timeframe. It should do the same for the I-70 Mountain Corridor.

Construction in this corridor also will require a massive level of communication with the traveling public. Corridor stakeholders need additional information about construction impacts and assurances that they will not bear the sole burden of communicating these impacts with the traveling public.

Funding

CSCUSA's involvement in more than seven years of effort to address improvements to the I-70 mountain corridor has always been tempered by fiscal reality. Colorado's statewide transportation needs are currently not being met by available funding. Colorado voters will have an opportunity to vote on Referenda C and D in November 2005. Even if both pass, however, the funding is unlikely to provide \$4 billion for the I-70 Mountain corridor. The projected \$4 billion represents optimistic, but not necessarily realistic funding sources that will be available for corridor improvements. We strongly urge C-DOT to contact every member of the congressional delegation and ask for a cohesive effort on behalf of all Coloradans to join forces to resolve these funding issues beyond the traditional allocations.

CSCUSA believes that the preferred alternative selected by CDOT and FHWA in the final PEIS will be the result of difficult choices with regard to funding. CSCUSA urges CDOT and FHWA to fund the nearer term capacity improvements first and then to preserve the corridor and study transit. It does not benefit or behoove any corridor stakeholder to insist on a preferred alternative without reliable funding to implement that alternative.

Transit

CSCUSA agrees with the I-70 Corridor Coalition that the transit will be needed to provide an addition to the highway system to address the longer-term transportation needs of the corridor. Transit must be at least as fast as the highway mode, provide seamless connections to DIA and be networked into systems that serve the Front Range and corridor communities and destinations. The transit mode need not be aligned with the highway; actual alignment should be determined in the future based on need, technology, financing and connectivity.

The transit mode must be one that Front Range and corridor residents will use regularly, so it must be inexpensive for the rider and provide virtually door-to-door service, with minimal hassles and mode changes. The simple reality is that the Front Range visitor will not use a system that is costly or complex. If the Front Range visitor doesn't use the system regularly, congestion in the corridor will not be reduced. A transit system that is attractive only to destination visitors does not solve the quality of life problem for Coloradans and doesn't serve the need of the I-70 Corridor PEIS.

The draft PEIS sets forth only the unlikely scenario whereby a Front Range family would drive from their home to a large park-and-ride near C-470. They would load their family and ski, camping, biking (or other) gear onto the transit system, ride to the Frisco Transit Center, where they would board a bus to take them to their destination in Summit County. CSCUSA suspects that faced with this much hassle to pursue recreational activities in the mountains, most visitors would visit less frequently or not at all.

The draft PEIS acknowledges that there are substantial unresolved issues with regard to transit in the corridor, such as identifying a transit operator, identifying a funding stream to cover "expected" subsidization, and devising a supporting local system to transport day recreation or overnight visit travelers to their destination. CSCUSA urges CDOT and FHWA to address these issues in a substantive way before committing significant resources to transit planning for the corridor.

A substantially more in-depth ridership study is needed for any promising transit mode. The ridership study conducted for the PEIS was flawed in a variety of ways—it was intended to be only a "snapshot" profile of users on one summer weekend and one winter weekend in 2000. Users' license plates were photographed and a small portion of users captured were subsequently interviewed by telephone, up to two months after the date on which their license plate number was captured. According to the ridership study, many of the respondents had no memory of their travel on the required weekend, so they were asked to speak generally about their most recent trip.

This "snapshot" showed a high percentage of travelers interested in using a high-speed monorail if it

were faster than driving and if the round-trip cost was \$20 per person. Similar responses were recorded for bus or van service that was faster than driving and cost \$20 round-trip. The study did not address door-to-door connection issues or transport of recreational equipment. Interest in transit options among this snapshot group fell off precipitously as the cost per roundtrip increased. CSCUSA is concerned that assumptions have been made in the PEIS about likely ridership of a transit system without adequate study of the full experience of using a transit system and without projecting the round-trip cost to users of the system. Given the economic constraints facing transportation in Colorado, assuming any sort of subsidy for operation of a transit system—or simply not addressing this issue seems unwise. CSCUSA would urge that CDOT and FHWA make plans to do extensive, investment-grade user research before proceeding with future transit plans. Such research should provide valuable information about the costs and details of a suitable future transit system for the corridor.

Again, Copper Mountain appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the draft PEIS for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you would like further input or information.

Steve Paccagnan, Vice-President, General Manager, Copper Mountain Resort

Categorized Comment	571	Page, Kristelle	Public	5/24/2005	By: Kristelle Page  Safety Persuasive Paper  Why do they say the saying "Safety First"? It is because safety is the most important thing to look at. It is especially for the I-70 Mountain Corridor expansion. Safety is the one thing we all need, and with the I-70 expansion, safety is a big issue. Safety should be the number one priority for this expansion because there are some options to a safer expansion, some assumptions are misleading, and there is a safest possible expansion. There are some options to a safer expansion. It is said that transit alternatives are safer than the 6-lane-highway alternatives. This is because 6-lane-highway alternatives could cause more rockslides and avalanches. This is very good news, because you are safer. And how can someone be so careless as to not think more carefully to the safety of those who come to Colorado? So, everyone should be cautious as to how much safety there is for your own sake, and other's sake on the expansion. You should be safe for the sake of everyone. Think about the safety possibilities, and how everyone should be safe. Some assumptions can be misleading. It was assumed that accident rates would remain the same in the future. Nobody will want to be on an unsafe expansion. And when assumptions such as this are made, it could be a disaster! Would you want I-70 and stuff along I-70 to become disastrous? Then it is true that assuming stuff when it comes to safety can cause more drama then you think. And expansion that is the safest has finally been found. The combination six-lane-highway with AGS (or the monorail) alternative is the safest of all alternatives. There really is no point in building an expansion if nobody will be safe on it, until now. I do care for the safety of myself and others, which is why I am glad to see that they found this alternative, because having this alternative, you are sure everyone is safe. Safety is first, which is why this expansion should go all the way through. Safety does have some objections, though no objection is more than safety. You may say the 6-lane-highway with AGS alternative costs too much, but money expense is nothing compared to lives being taken away. Also, you may say that the accident rate will be the same, but it still will be different than what the expansion was: people won't be used to it, and we do not know what natural disasters may happen. Then, some people may say there are more important things than safety (environment, noise, endangered animals and plants, etc.). Well, these things are important, but we should still consider human life the most valuable. So in all, safety is a huge issue, regardless of any objection. Finally, safety should and always be the number one priority for anything being built, such as the I-70 expansion. Safety first wasn't said by just anyone. People say it because these people mean it. We should all take safety seriously, because it will save lives, even your own.	Online
Categorized Comment	547	Pals, Jim	Public	5/23/2005	Thank you for providing this forum to submit general comments regarding the Draft PEIS. My comments are general in nature. First, I certainly agree with your interest in identifying various solutions to the transportation needs on the I-70 corridor. My wish is that as ideas are put forth, and that funds are available, that we will have viable solutions to the myriad of needs expressed. My two general concerns are as follows: 1. A high level of import be given to the existence of our historic properties. This historic area is what Colorado stands for, what Colorado has evolved from and now lives. This is so very important to our personal history and our economic viability. 2. Our fears regarding the long term construction period in this tight valley is a constant issue with us. Many citizens use I-70 several times per day. Our local commerce uses the highway daily. In many cases I-70 is our main street, our side street, our alley, and even sometimes our No Outlet. We think about this issue a lot. It is so important to us that the timing, the access roads and the detours need addressing at the Tier called "this moment."  Thank you. Jim Pals May 23, 2005	Online
Categorized Comment	65	Parker, Roger C.	Public	1/12/2005	Seasonal traffic breaks between the winter and summer; however, both groups typically travel with extensive equipment (skis/camping gear). This fact will cause transportation alternatives (Bus, Rail) to be used at minimal levels. Out of state travelers would of course continue in their personal vehicles.  Highway improvements are therefore the only improvements which can help achieve the objective.  I believe the alternative calling for two reversible car pool or toll lanes is the best. It would increase the lanes available during high need periods by two lanes instead of one. This also should postpone additional improvements in 2025 since again two lanes would be available.	Form
Categorized Comment	485	Parmelee, Steve	Public	5/11/2005	Safety should be a major concern.  As the population grows in Colorado and the nation, use of I-70 internally and as a national road will increase. We should be real. We should try to use science and not emotional politics to make decisions. Long haul trucks and regular citizens will increasingly use I-70.  Therefore, we should six lane I-70 where ever the engineering is possible.  We should add another tunnel for alternating weekend Denver to the mountains traffic.  Folks can take the existing train on the existing tracks if they want; Colorado does not need another long train track.  There are other mountain passes that could be used when the weather, rock slides, and accidents close the interstate. For example, Cottonwood Pass from Eagle/Gypsum to Highway 82 by Catherine's store could be made into an all-season paved road to handle emergencies (this would also help Glenwood Springs). Secondly, the Red Buffalo Pass by Vail I-70 should be revisited to help when Vail Pass is closed for weather/accidents/maintenance.  Thank you for your previous good work on Vail Pass, State Highway 82, Glenwood Canyon, Wolf Creek Pass, etc.	Online
Categorized Comment	753	Parsons, Mckie	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  Widening to six lanes will almost be obsolete before completion and destroy prized environment and mountain towns en route in the process. Like some of alternate suggestion relating to cooperative efforts at changing behaviors realizing that it is a difficult task. While building mass transit, set up business in cooperation with ski resorts to comfortably bus people to and from destination area at regular scheduled times much the same as CME does to DIA. People wanting to move around the county could use the Stage or rent a car. A fleet of tour-like buses including maintenance is less costly, long term, than expansion of I-70 and would provide employment opportunities as well. Additionally, this would decrease the impact of fuel exhaust on our environment and wear and tear on local streets surfaces Mckie Parsons mckiepar@msn.com 74 Shane Dillon	Written
Categorized Comment	774	Parsons, Tom	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  Any action which further postpones a development plan for mass transit is a waste of time and money. Tom Parsons, 229 Lakeview Circle West, Breckenridge, CO 80424 • tparsons1000@aol.com	Written



Categorized Comment	502	Parsons, Tom	Public	5/16/2005	Creating further congestion on I-70 by extensive highway construction will shift traffic to US hwy 285 and to State hwy 9 over Hoosier pass and through Breckenridge. Have you planned for this?	Online
Categorized Comment	564	Pavlov, Marge	Public	5/23/2005	In selecting the preferred alternative/alternatives to alleviate the I-70 Corridor congestion, CDOT is faced with meeting the needs of the communities along the I-70 Corridor while maintaining budgetary constraints departments of transportation must operate under across the nation. Not an easy task.  Any decision must include a long-term vision. A single alternative will not work. To be effective, multi-modal capacity is required. Ideally, we must connect DIA to the mountain communities (and beyond), while improving accessibility and decreasing congestion during peak travel hours.  The cost cap of \$4 Billion eliminates a number of alternatives addressed in the PEIS. Realistically, the question arises: "Can any effective solution be achieved under \$4 Billion, while effectively addressing citizen concerns?" Lifestyle, environmental issues, safety and preservation of historical landmarks along the corridor are just a few of the concerns addressed in public comments.  A privately funded transit system, meeting reasonable long-term financial stability requirements, should be considered as one of many preferred alternatives. (The terms Fixed Guideway, Advanced Guideway System, Magnetic Levitation System, Monorail have been interchanged in describing possible transit system alternatives). An elevated Fixed Guideway would have minimal environmental impact and would require minimal "footprint", thereby preserving the lifestyle of communities along the corridor, while alleviating congestion during peak hours.  A privately funded system, while working in cooperation with CDOT, could allow an additional alternative which would satisfy concerns of the communities while allowing CDOT to work within budget. After all, a privately funded alternative theoretically carries a taxpayer price tag of \$0.  Marge Pavlov 1153 Bergen Parkway, #126 Evergreen, CO 80439 mpavlov180@yahoo.com	Online
Categorized Comment	549	Perkin, Linda	Public	5/23/2005	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the current version of the Draft PEIS and have attended 2 informational meetings.  My comments concern the Herman Gulch area (Exit 218 off of I-70). This area has cabins which are considered historical and the Herman Gulch trailhead. I am the owner of one of the cabins, built by my father (started 1937) and have spent significant amount of time there all of my life. Needless to say, there have certainly been changes in the environment there over the past 50 years! I know I can't expect the quiet solitude I remember from my youth, but I need to do what I can to maintain as much of the remaining quality. Currently the traffic on I-70 can be seen through leafless trees and the noise precludes regular conversation outdoors. This area is used recreationally by hikers and we cabin owners with an emphasis on outdoor enjoyment. Therefore, I recommend this area be considered "Activity A" with attention especially to noise monitoring and mitigation. You are welcome to contact me and to take decibel readings at my cabin. Resale of cabins in our area has been difficult, with the primary reason being the highway noise.  Secondly and related, it appears the current configuration for highway widening involves both the north and south sides of the highway, with the north side being taken up to the current treeline. I submit that this brings traffic even closer to our cabins. A previous plan map shows the widening all taking place to the south and this is the plan our group, the Herman Gulch Homeowners Association, favored. Our cabins are on the north side of I-70 and placing the right lane (truck climbing lane?) closer significantly impacts our ability to enjoy the outdoor mountain environment in our historically recognized cabins. Who enjoys sitting next to a highway with the noise and pollution? There are no buildings on the south side of the highway, the area is flat and is closer to the established bike trail.  Thank you. Linda E. Perkin	Online
Categorized Comment	633	Colorado Ski Country USA	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	May 24, 2005  Cecilia Joy Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011 Cecilia.joy@dot.state.co.us  Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228 Jean.Wallace@fhwa.dot.gov  Re: I-70 Draft PEIS  Dear Cecilia and Jean:  Colorado Ski Country USA (CSCUSA) is the trade association representing 24 Colorado ski resorts, most of which (Winter Park, SolVista, Loveland, Arapahoe Basin, Copper Mountain, Breckenridge, Keystone, Vail, Beaver Creek, Ski Cooper, Sunlight Mountain Resort, Aspen/Snowmass and Steamboat) rely on the I-70 Mountain Corridor for resort access for both in-state day and in-and-out-of-state destination skiers.  CSCUSA appreciates the extensive public and stakeholder outreach that has been the hallmark of the I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) preparation team. The process of engaging with stakeholders along the I-70 Mountain Corridor has been a lengthy and arduous one, and CSCUSA wishes to commend the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for their fortitude and, more importantly, for the extensive and thorough analysis that is included in the PEIS.  CSCUSA has been actively involved in discussions with CDOT and FHWA for more than seven years on the need for improvements to the I-70 Mountain Corridor. CSCUSA participated in the Steering Committee for the Major Investment Study (MIS) that was conducted on the corridor and has been involved in the Mountain Corridor Advisory Committee (MCAC) and the Finance Committee for the effort currently underway on the PEIS.  CSCUSA appreciates the opportunity to provide the following comments on the Draft PEIS.  Ski Industry Trends  The Draft PEIS projects that skier visits at resorts along the I-70 Mountain Corridor will increase by 13 percent between 2000 and 2025. The PEIS also states that data from CSCUSA is among the data used to make this projection. While CSCUSA realizes that part of CDOT and FHWA's task is to model future traffic demand, CSCUSA's data on past skier visits is not an accurate predictor of future skier visits on the micro scale set forth in the demand model.  CSCUSA does not have a crystal ball, but we do know that the recent decline in destination skier visits has been nearly reversed, with international visitors being a particularly strong component of the reversal. Additionally, Front Range skiers make up approximately 40 percent of annual skier visits in Colorado. With continued population growth projected for the Front Range, CSCUSA expects that the Front Range will continue to attract younger participants into the sport of skiing. Front Range guests are a sophisticated market—price sensitive, snow sensitive and traffic sensitive. The wide availability of low-priced season pass products is expected to continue and, in years with good snowfall, Front Range skiers will ski more than they will in drier years. Nearly all of these skiers are I-70 users.  The Front Range skier, armed with an affordable season pass, has changed his/her travel behavior as much as the I-70 mountain corridor will allow over the last several years. The season pass holder, having invested in the cost of a season pass, is now more inclined to leave the Front Range very early in the morning on a weekend day and return earlier in the day or return after the resorts have closed to avoid peak traffic. In addition, while the day skier market continues to be strong, we have seen a substantial increase in the Colorado overnight category with Front Range skiers taking more overnight trips in each of the last several years, at least in part because of I-70 congestion. These behaviors have caused a spreading out of the peak demand times on the corridor on winter weekends. The season pass holder will ski more some years and less in others, depending on snow quality and abundance, perception of hassles on I-70, the weather in Denver and other variables. However, a day skier from the Front Range who buys a lift ticket for a single day is more likely to ski a longer day, returning home after resorts have closed for the day.  To the extent that the PEIS discusses the need to change travel behavior and suggests the possibility of "alternate recreation schedules" as ways to address congestion issues on the corridor, CSCUSA urges CDOT and FHWA to recognize that, with regard to winter schedules in particular, there is not additional opportunity for changes in travel behavior or alternate recreation schedules for skiers. Ski resorts are up and running during winter daylight hours, normally 9 am to 3 or 4 pm, depending on the time of season.	Email

Efforts to change behavior will not be able to alter the length of a ski day or the interest of the skier in skiing enough of a ski day to feel as though he or she got his or her money's worth that day. Ski resorts have offered incentives to skiers to purchase passes for use during off-peak times that exclude weekends. These products are well received by the limited number of individuals who are not tied to work and school obligations Monday through Friday. CSCUSA does not foresee fundamental changes in work and school schedules that would allow alternate recreation schedules in the winter months.

Access to skiing and to other mountain recreation opportunities is a quality of life issue for Coloradans, an economic development issue for Colorado, especially the Front Range, and an economic impact issue for the entire state. Annual skier spending in Colorado totals approximately \$2.5 billion. A majority of that total is generated along the I-70 mountain corridor. Colorado ski resorts compete for skiers in a global marketplace and I-70 currently represents at a minimum a challenge and for many a significant obstacle when choosing to vacation in Colorado. We can say with certainty that this number would be higher without the current competitive disadvantage presented by I-70 relative to other destinations.

What's the alternative?

The PEIS details the need for improvements to the I-70 corridor—increased capacity, improved accessibility and mobility, and decreased congestion. The “no action” and “minimal action” alternatives considered in the PEIS do not serve the need on the corridor and should be discarded from further consideration.

The I-70 mountain corridor desperately needs capacity improvements in the near-term and a long-term vision to address future anticipated growth. CSCUSA supports continued efforts by CDOT and FHWA to address the underlying need while providing for and accommodating sensitivity to the environment respect for community values, improvements to corridor safety and an implementable approach. The current congestion on the corridor frustrates travelers and poses continuing air quality challenges, as vehicles stuck in traffic idle on I-70 for hours during peak periods.

CSCUSA supports the addition of an additional highway lane both eastbound and westbound between Floyd Hill and the Eisenhower Tunnel, including a third bore to add capacity to the Eisenhower and Twin Tunnels. In addition, CSCUSA supports preserving the corridor for future transit. Consistent with the I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition, CSCUSA believes currently there is neither the technology nor knowledge about transit in a mountain corridor to implement such a transit system. We also agree it is time to begin research and planning for corridor transit in the future.

This alternative will provide for much needed capacity improvements within the 20-year time horizon that have a reasonable chance of being fundable with anticipated monies. It recognizes the longer-term growth anticipated along the corridor and throughout the state, and allows for deliberate planning for such growth, both in terms of mobility and fiscal responsibility.

Sequencing

The I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition has commented at length about its preferred sequencing of capacity improvements to the corridor, with a particular preference to complete improvements in the Idaho Springs area last. While CSCUSA is respectful of the Coalition and its preferred approach, CSCUSA would urge that CDOT and FHWA bring their considerable expertise to bear on the issue of sequencing and determine the sequencing of improvements between Floyd Hill and the Eisenhower Tunnels that will optimize mobility and mitigate congestion. The addition of capacity to the entire stretch between Floyd Hill and the Eisenhower Tunnels, while leaving Idaho Springs unimproved until the end of the process will simply result in a bottleneck at Idaho Springs.

Construction Impacts

CSCUSA agrees with the I-70 Corridor Coalition that further analysis of corridor mobility during the construction period of the selected alternative should be considered and set forth in the Final PEIS. The draft assumes that alternatives will be completed by 2025 with evaluations on how well they meet estimated 2025 travel demand. Construction mobility restrictions and related impacts should be identified and evaluated, so that corridor stakeholders and visitors can plan accordingly. Special controls during construction should be considered, including off-peak controls or incentives for trucks and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes.

Additionally, CSCUSA believes that a 15-year projected construction period is too long. Every effort should be brought to bear to compress the timeframe during which this vital economic lifeline is under construction. CDOT has successfully compressed the Southeast Corridor or “T-REX” project into a 6-8-year timeframe. It should do the same for the I-70 Mountain Corridor.

Construction in this corridor also will require a massive level of communication with the traveling public. Corridor stakeholders need additional information about construction impacts and assurances that they will not bear the sole burden of communicating these impacts with the traveling public.

Funding

CSCUSA's involvement in more than seven years of effort to address improvements to the I-70 mountain corridor has always been tempered by fiscal reality. Colorado's statewide transportation needs are currently being met by available funding. Colorado voters will have an opportunity to vote on Referenda C and D in November 2005. Even if both pass, however, the funding is unlikely to provide \$4 billion for the I-70 Mountain corridor. The projected \$4 billion represents optimistic, but not necessarily realistic funding sources that will be available for corridor improvements. CSCUSA strongly urges CDOT and FHWA to contact each member of the Colorado congressional delegation to urge their support for and involvement in securing funding for the I-70 corridor that goes beyond traditional federal allocations.

CSCUSA believes that the preferred alternative selected by CDOT and FHWA in the final PEIS will be the result of difficult choices with regard to funding. CSCUSA urges CDOT and FHWA to fund the nearer term capacity improvements first and then to preserve the corridor and study transit. It does not benefit or behoove any corridor stakeholder to insist on a preferred alternative without reliable funding to implement that alternative.

Transit

CSCUSA agrees with the I-70 Corridor Coalition that the transit will be needed to provide an addition to the highway system to address the longer-term transportation needs of the corridor. Transit must be at least as fast as the highway mode, provide seamless connections to DIA and be networked into systems that serve the Front Range and corridor communities and destinations. The transit mode need not be aligned with the highway; actual alignment should be determined in the future based on need, technology, financing and connectivity.

The transit mode must be one that Front Range and corridor residents will use regularly, so it must be inexpensive for the rider and provide virtually door-to-door service, with minimal hassles and mode changes. The simple reality is that the Front Range visitor will not use a system that is costly or complex. If the Front Range visitor doesn't use the system regularly, congestion in the corridor will not be reduced. A transit system that is attractive only to destination visitors does not solve the quality of life problem for Coloradans and doesn't serve the need of the I-70 Corridor PEIS.

The draft PEIS sets forth only the unlikely scenario whereby a Front Range family would drive from their home to a large park-and-ride near C-470. They would load their family and ski, camping, biking (or other) gear onto the transit system, ride to the Frisco Transit Center, where they would board a bus to take them to their destination in Summit County. CSCUSA suspects when faced with this much hassle to pursue recreational activities in the mountains, most visitors would visit less frequently or not at all.

The draft PEIS acknowledges that there are substantial unresolved issues with regard to transit in the corridor, such as identifying a transit operator, identifying a funding stream to cover “expected” subsidization, and devising a supporting local system to transport day recreation or overnight travelers to their destination. CSCUSA urges CDOT and FHWA to address these issues in a substantive way before committing significant resources to transit planning for the corridor.

A substantially more in-depth ridership study is needed for any promising transit mode. The ridership study conducted for the PEIS was flawed in a variety of ways—it was intended to be only a “snapshot” profile of users on one summer weekend and one winter weekend in 2000. Users' license plates were photographed and a small portion of users captured were subsequently interviewed by telephone, up to two months after the date on which their license plate number was captured. According to the ridership study, many of the respondents had no memory of their travel on the specific weekend studied, so they were asked to speak generally about their most recent trip.

This “snapshot” showed a high percentage of travelers interested in using a high-speed monorail if it were faster than driving and if the round-trip cost was \$20 per person. Similar responses were recorded for bus or van service that was faster than driving and cost \$20 round-trip. The study did not address door-to-door connection issues or transport of recreational equipment. Interest in transit options among this snapshot group fell off precipitously as the cost per roundtrip increased. CSCUSA is concerned that assumptions have been made in the PEIS about likely ridership of a transit system without adequate study of the full experience of using a transit system and without projecting the round-trip cost to users of the system. Given the economic constraints facing transportation in Colorado, assuming any sort of subsidy for operation of a transit system—or simply not addressing this issue seems unwise. CSCUSA would urge that CDOT and FHWA make plans to do extensive, investment-grade user research before proceeding with future transit plans. Such research should provide valuable information about the costs and details of a suitable future transit system for the corridor.

Loveland Ski Area

One of CSCUSA's member ski resorts, Loveland Ski Area, is located where it is particularly likely to

have its business disrupted by construction of improvements to the corridor and by the construction of a third bore to the Eisenhower Tunnels. CSCUSA would urge CDOT and FHWA to engage Loveland prior to finalizing the PEIS to discuss impacts, alternatives, options and mitigation with regard to construction and the Eisenhower Tunnels. CSCUSA would be pleased to facilitate such discussions, as we believe that they are essential to a fair outcome for Loveland.

In conclusion, CSCUSA appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the draft PEIS for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you would like further input or information.

Sincerely yours,

Rob Perlman  
President and CEO

Categorized Comment	434	Petrie, BJ	Public	4/10/2005	REGARDING THE PUBLIC HEARING "CONSTRUCTION" DISPLAY BOARD	Online
					<p>NO ALTERNATIVE ROUTES DURING CONSTRUCTION...Imagine living up Fall River Road where the only access for a conventional car is via I-70. Now imagine that there is a forest fire, started by lightning, on one side of the ridge at the bottom of the valley near I-70. You are one of 200 residents living in the 8-mile stretch of Fall River Road. You get a call from the emergency response team to evacuate. You do, only to run into a traffic jam at the bottom of the road, not due to the 200 people evacuating, but due to road construction at Exit 238.</p> <p>You see, there are no side streets, service roads or alternative routes. The only way in and the only way out is via I-70. That's what makes construction in the mountain corridor different than metro Denver. There is simply no way to avoid the construction. A forest fire did occur at the bottom of Fall River Road in 2002, and it can happen again!! CDOT needs a concrete plan for exodus if such an event were to occur.</p> <p>TRAVEL DURING PEAK CONSTRUCTION PERIODS...The Draft PEIS indicates CDOT will aim to keep the highway operational during peak travel periods. What about the off-peak travel periods when most members of the community are currently mobile? The Draft PEIS states that the 15-year construction period, assumes the entire corridor.</p> <p>I have strong concerns that I will not be able:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· to go to work,</li> <li>· to the grocery store,</li> <li>· to church,</li> <li>· the post office,</li> <li>· the gas station,</li> <li>· and many other daily places.</li> </ul> <p>without enduring construction delays because there is no escape--no alternate route.</p> <p>It is expected that transportation officials will tout their expertise in managing construction activities as demonstrated on I-25 during T-REX and US 40 on Berthoud Pass. While there is no doubt that CDOT has considerable expertise, the Mountain Corridor is much more restricted than I-25. I-70 traffic is many times greater than US 40 at Berthoud Pass.</p> <p>SOLUTIONS...How will we survive 15 years of construction in our narrow community? We can survive if CDOT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provides alternate routes around, not through the construction.</li> <li>2. Provides an alternate route for Fall River residents under I-70 and over Clear Creek to Stanley Road, just as exists today for N. Spring Gulch.</li> <li>3. Provides a realistic construction schedule for each section of the corridor, not assume that the 15-year construction period is the entire corridor.</li> </ol> <p>CDOT needs to work with Clear Creek County to develop resolutions that do not shut down the County.</p> <p>cW Borowsky</p>	
					<p>My name is Amy Phillips, and I live in Avon. I built my retirement house about ten years ago, and I'll be retiring in 2025, so just to give you a little perspective.</p> <p>The thing that hit me the most was how wonderful it was that everyone from Dumont and Clear Creek County came up and how much work you all have done, and they're really looking at that.</p> <p>The other thing that hit me was once all those cars get here, where are we going to put them? Someone else mentioned that, and we already have many, many, many parking issues.</p> <p>And I really, really enjoyed many of the comments about the vision. And I started thinking about the fact that as a community and as a state, Colorado really, I think, is getting away from the Californication and the one car, one person mentality, and that voters down in Denver have really taken a big step on that saying, Hey, we don't like T-Rex, it's not working so great.</p> <p>All we see is we're going to have a bigger, faster, wider place to move all these cars and they're really looking visionary down there approving some of the funding for some of the light-rail projects and things like that. And I think for the coalition and for the I-70 corridor to not fully embrace what they're already doing down there -- because quite frankly, I won't go down there anymore. I hate it. I can't deal with all the traffic and all the cars.</p> <p>And what they're already doing down there, I think we need to look at that and see how the I-70 corridor can become an extension of some of the light-rail and some of the projects down there that really will make this mountain town, you know, hopefully more like some of the mountain towns in Europe where once you get where you're going, you get off of whatever transit you came on. You don't have a car, you don't drive around the roundabouts in a snowstorm on your cell phone with Texas plates, you have taken transit to get here, you know.</p> <p>And I really think we have to seriously take a look at some of the financial issues as to how that can be funded to not make it so that we have more cars coming into the mountains, because I really do think the state as a whole is ready for that and that the city of Denver has already set that precedence.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
					<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Courtney Phillips 104 Hideaway Ct. Dillon, CO 80435 quirkfyddle@comcast.net</p>	Written
					<p>1. In the Executive Summary/p 34 the report states that the I-70 corridor offers views of historic mountain towns and occasional glimpses of wildlife. Most residents of Clear Creek County find this erroneous. The viewing of wildlife is a constant fact of daily life. Floyd Hill is a frequent habitat of elk and many times a danger to traffic due to their frequent crossing of the highway. Big Horn Sheep are often seen grazing the grass next to the Highway close to the twin tunnels. From there they migrate to Empire and Georgetown where the Division of Wildlife has a viewing station on the east side of the highway. Deer roam the entire corridor, as well as fox, mountain lion and an occasional wolf. Wildlife crossings are a necessity in this area and should not be an afterthought. We would like acknowledgement that the area over the top of the twin tunnels provides an important and frequently used passage for deer and other wildlife. Game trails are visible from the frontage road.</p> <p>The report states that the corridor offers views of historic mountain towns&amp; however the necessity of sound barriers to mitigate the noise will destroy these views.</p> <p>2. The study neglects to acknowledge the existence of the James Peak Wilderness area as well as the Mountain Evans Wilderness Area. Of the many Wilderness Areas addressed in the study, James Peak is the closest in proximity to I-70. The study suggests that the visual impact to these areas will be negligible due to less pollution when traffic moves smoothly as opposed to stop and go. It fails to take into account the stop and go traffic with 15 years of construction.</p> <p>3. In the mitigation Summary, 3-19-1, it states that special consideration is given to the Genesee Bridge over I-70 since it is the last glimpse of the Continental Divide from West bound I-70 until West of Silver Plume. This is incorrect. From Idaho Springs to the far side of Empire Junction there is a view of the snow covered peaks of the Continental Divide. This is approximately 8 miles of spectacular scenery. Special Design consideration should also be given to this section of the highway.</p> <p>4. In the Cumulative Impact Analysis, p 4-31, the study states that Planned future development will consume 32% of the Corridor View shed Area. Pressures for additional increased development from</p>	Online

alternatives might alter the highly valued Corridor character from a rural mountain character to an urban character. This drastic change to the visual experience of the traveler and the residents was not taken into consideration when analyzing the visual impact of the preferred alternatives.

5. Health impacts. Where is it? The study indicates that with the improved flow of traffic there will be less pollution in spite of 150% increase in traffic. There is no mention made of the 15 years of construction with stop and go traffic. There are numerous studies that show increased health risks to those living and working within 250 yards of heavy traffic areas. Idaho springs has 2 schools, a Recreational Center and a Senior Center within 100 yards of the highway. Carlson Elementary School has been at this location for over 100 years. Any detours during construction will take traffic on Colorado Blvd and within 10-15 yards of classrooms and the playground. Five historic churches are also located on Colorado Blvd which is the only alternate route through town. A study of the health impacts of the preferred alternatives should be included in this PEIS.

6. Environmental Justice 3.11 In spite of the fact that the PEIS attempts to discuss affordable housing, I see no assurances that those small affordable homes in eastern and central Idaho Springs and Silver Plume that are extremely close to the existing I-70 will not be adversely affected if not eliminated. (the study mentions homes in western I. S. not being impacted) Some of these homes are occupied by elderly residents or low income workers who can not afford to purchase a home in another area. There is limited room in the valley to build alternative affordable housing. Clear Creek County has one lumber yard, one pharmacy and one supermarket. All are within approximately 25 yards of the existing I-70. Not only is the County and the town dependent on the revenues from these businesses, but the same is true of the residents. Elderly and low income populations often have limited ability to travel outside of the County for these services. 3.11.62 states that the exact extent of the direct impacts to low income and non-low income populations cannot be determined at the Tier 1 level. They do go on to state that the social effects, such as noise and diminution of aesthetic values would be the same for low income as for non-low income populations. How was this measured? It seems only reasonable to assume that those living next to the highway will be more heavily impacted than those living on the mountain side. This Environmental Justice information is invalid.

Is this an attempt to sacrifice the affordable housing and shopping in Clear Creek for the convenience of 2nd home owners further to the west?

7. Economic impact: Since the majority of the construction will be in Clear Creek County and is estimated to take 15 years to complete, it is also reasonable to assume that the economic impact will be devastating. In spite of this, the PEIS does not make any attempt to evaluate the impact as a stand alone county. Recreational impacts are mentioned in the report, but the impact on Loveland Basin and the Rafting Industry may be enormous. The revenues from these activities contribute considerably to our County's economy. Do we have any assurances that the Creek will not be moved again? The study looks at the impact of nine counties averaged together, even though some of the counties are not in the I-70 corridor. This invalidates this part of the study.

8. HOV/HOT lanes. As indicated in the preferred alternative, one would enter at the US 6 junction (Kermis) with I-70 and would not be able to exit until Empire Junction. Is this Economic Justice? Once traveling in this lane, it makes it impossible for one to exit into Idaho Springs for fuel, sight-seeing or to visit a restaurant. It also means that emergency services and residents cannot pass traffic jams and get to their destinations in Idaho Springs. This is a biased alternative in favor of through travelers.

9. The PEIS is a lengthy study that at first glance seems to cover a myriad of considerations. However, there are many deficiencies as mentioned above. There is no indication in the study as to how the various impacts were weighed in making the final determination of the preferred alternatives. Did the environmental and community values play a role in the decision or was it truly only based on cost?

10. At the public hearings, many individuals commented on the questionable future of the economy and the availability of fossil fuels. In light of this, I would encourage CDOT to implement an Adaptive Management Plan by fixing the pinch points of traffic in the corridor and then reevaluating the impact. This could be implemented with available funds and started in the near future.

Consideration should also be given to alternate routes through the mountains and long range plans for high speed mass transit.

Categorized Comment	446	Pitts, Bill	Public	4/23/2005	A lot of time and public input has been accumulated and it appears that the progress along the lines that have been suggested and proposed are quite adequate. Of course my suggestion was to use light rail, but this has been over ridden by the present configuration. That's ok. Until I get so old I can't fly my own airplane to Denver the ground transportation for me makes little difference, but for grounders, it's ok.  Bill Pitts, Grand Junction, CO	Online
Categorized Comment	129	Place, Luke	Public	1/12/2005	My name is Luke Place, and I live just off of I-70 about five miles. The first slide you showed was the bridge over here, and -- pardon me? Can you hear better?  The slide that you were showing shows the bridge that you go past when you come up the hill, and off in the distance is the Front Range and the Continental Divide, and it's a beautiful shot. It's a beautiful picture every time you come home, and you can see the mountain up there in the background. That's why I moved here some years ago. It symbolizes the fact that Colorado is such a mountain state and such a wonderful place.  This is our very identity and the quality of life for everything else and why we're attractive for people to move here for industry, for executives to come here. It is -- the I-70 corridor is Colorado's gateway to the Rockies and it's our access to this beauty and it's part of our very soul. And while that's an emotional statement, it is also, you know, understanding what Colorado is. That is why we are attractive to others. But to tourists, this corridor needs to be protected.  Come to the point. And I wish I understood this in greater depth. I haven't had time to study it, the PEIS, in detail. But it strikes me that the two main problems here are the \$4 billion cutoff and the 20-year planning, but once you adopt those two assumptions, you invariably end up with the decision that is not the one that is most effective.  It strikes me that the choices here are essentially of the policy and political decisions rather than decisions that were driven by practice for planning. We need -- because we're dealing with the long-term future of Colorado, we need to extend that time frame out and look at the overall picture, because it's not just us today; it's our children, it's the future of the state.  Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	677	Clear Creek County Board of Commissioners	Counties	12/22/2004	Clear Creek County Post Office Box 2000 Georgetown, Colorado 80444 Telephone (303) 569 3251 (303) 679 2300  December 22, 2004  Ms. Cecelia Joy, Planning and Environmental Manager Ms. Chris Paulsen Planning & Environment Department CDOT 18500 East Colfax Aurora, CO 80011  Dear Ms. Joy and Ms. Paulsen:  We are writing in regards to the request for draft PEIS hard copies. In our original request, we asked for 40 hard copies of the draft PEIS. We were then told to submit a second request listing names of the 40 recipients. We complied with this request, providing a list of people and agencies. Of these 40 people/agencies, you cross-referenced requests and handled some of them independently of our list. Our request was then reduced to 28 copies that were delivered to the County Courthouse for distribution. Actually twenty nine copies were delivered to our offices which contained a full notebook an attached spiral booklet of appendices A & B and a disc for the remaining appendices C-Q, Lists of Charts, Tables, and Figures. Following distribution of these, we received an immediate concern from these 29 people/agencies that the disc was too difficult to review on computer, being too large to view on screen, slowing of their computer systems, etc. Per your request, we are now requesting that these remaining appendices be sent to the following list of people/agencies.  It was our understanding when we initially ordered these 40 hard copies, that we were going to obtain 40 hard copies and not part hard copy, part disc. This is an extremely large and complex document and trying to research it, much less view it on a computer screen, is quite challenging for any person.  Below is our list of the 29 people/agencies who need the remaining appendices in hard copy format. · 1 Bob Poirot, Commissioner · 1 Harry Dale, Commissioner · 1 Joan Drury, Commissioner Elect · 1 Kevin O'Malley, Commissioner Elect · 1 County Attorney Robert Loeffler	Written

- 2 County Consultants John Putnam and the second to be determined
- 2 Planning Director, Frederick Rollenhagen and Doug Lesh
- 1 Open Space Commission Tim Mauck
- 1 Clear Creek County Planning Commission Steve Schultz
- 1 Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation, Peggy Stokstad
- 1 Clear Creek County Tourism Bureau, Heather Lopez
- 1 Historic Georgetown Inc., Ron Neely
- 1 Mill Creek Valley Historical Society, Chuck Harmon
- 1 Idaho Springs Historical Society, Chee Chee Bell
- 1 People for Silver Plume, Gary Register
- 3 City of Idaho Springs (The City has apparently made their own request.)
- 2 Town of Silver Plume (Council & Staff)
- 3 Town of Georgetown (Council, Staff, Mayor)
- 1 Town of Georgetown Design Review Commission
- 3 Town of Empire (Council, Staff, Mayor)

Please accept this letter as formal response to your request made through J.F. Sato representative Teresa O'Neil. In addition, we request that the comment period not begin until we receive the complete study in useable format. Your prompt consideration and response is requested.

Sincerely,

CLEAR CREEK BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Robert Poirot, Chairman  
Harry Dale, Commissioner  
Jo Ann Sorensen, Commissioner

cc: David Ortiz, FHWA

Categorized Comment	678	Clear Creek County Board of Commissioners	Counties	12/22/2004	Clear Creek County Post Office Box 2000 Georgetown, Colorado 80444 Telephone (303) 569-3251 (303) 679-2300  December 22, 2004  Mr. David Ortiz FHWA, Colorado Division 12300 West Dakota Lakewood, CO 80228  Dear Mr. Ortiz:  Again, we would like to request an extension of the review period for the draft I-70 PEIS.  On December 10, 2004, Clear Creek County received 29 copies (the requested 28 plus an extra) of the Draft I-70 PEIS. These copies were requested to be in hard copy format for various agencies and officials who were listed out by agency and name per CDOT's request. The copies were delivered to our offices and contained a full notebook, an attached spiral booklet of appendices A & B, and a disc for the remaining appendices C-Q, Lists of Charts, Tables, and Figures. Following distribution of these, we received an immediate concern from these 29 officials/agencies that the disc was too difficult to review on computer, being too large to view on screen, slowing of their computer systems, etc. We immediately contacted CDOT regarding this problem and they have replied that another list was needed of these officials/agencies. We have, again, complied with this request and CDOT, through their contractor J.F. Sato & Associates, replied that this was possible, however, it would take time to compile and submit these to our agencies.  Therefore, due to the delay in our receipt of the complete study in useable format, we are, again, asking for an extension to the review period for the draft I-70 PEIS. It was our understanding when we requested the hard copies for the various officials/agencies that we were going to receive hard copies and not part hard copy, part disc. We ask your agency to please consider this extension to allow our agencies and officials sufficient time to review such a large and complex document. Your prompt consideration and response is requested.  Sincerely,  CLEAR CREEK BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  Robert J. Poirot, Chairman Harry Dale Commissioner Jo Ann Sorensen, Commissioner  cc: U.S. Senator Wayne Allard U.S. Senator Elect Ken Salazar U.S. Congressman Mark Udall Colorado State Senator Joan Fitz-Gerald Colorado Representative Tom Plant	Written
Categorized Comment	480	Pollack, Susan	Public	1/26/2005	I have always been for AGS and was sorry that money was not allocated for testing this system.  With the cost of oil increasing and not likely to decrease, I do not understand why spending money on expanding the highway makes sense. By the time that the project is complete, the world may be out of oil (some predictions). I think that we should fix the four lanes we have now particularly in Dowd Junction, west of Wolcott, and east of Idaho Springs. Then we should look at alternative methods of transportation. As I said, I am for the AGS. We are being forced to think outside the "paving" box. Now is the time to seriously test other modes of transportation.  Let's save our precious mountain environment.	Form
Categorized Comment	136	Potter, Doug	Public	1/12/2005	Hi, My name is Doug Potter, and I've been a resident here for 29 years. I'm a proud member of the Clear Creek school educational team.  And I just can't believe we would want to support something this huge to have more cars, more people. If you build it, they will come. I do think the long view would be that we are going to run out of fossil fuels to support the automobile, and it seems kind of silly -- a major mistake in a big sense.  But my real concern is on a smaller level. I'm worried about the impact of the small business and our families and the schools that support those. You know, this is a really fragile system we have up here. We're small and, you know, the families are the basis for everything that we do up here. And I just really think it's going to have a terrible impact on the families, on the short term with the construction and beyond.  You know, you talk about the economic benefits on that chart that you explained with the lines on it. I can see the benefits in Eagle County and Summit County, and it just looks to me like Clear Creek County is going to be like dog hash; we're going to be the conduit so that some of those counties to the west can reap the economic benefits.  And that concerns me.  Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	539	Potter, Robert	Public	5/22/2005	Our property is a residence near Exit 218, Herman Gulch, on US Forest Service land. The property is known as 4351 Herman Gulch Road. We have owned this property since 1976. The highway noise has become more and more unbearable as traffic has increased throughout the years. ANY of the proposed modifications to I-70 will only exacerbate the problem.  1. We request that you conduct noise studies at our property.  2. We request that you consider this area as "Activity Level A" vs. "B" as we live here in order to enjoy the outdoors.  3. We request that any expansion of I-70 be made to the south of exit 218 and that you not further encroach to the north is this area.  4. We request noise mitigation through the most practicable means, e.g., noise walls, covered highway, etc. so as to reduce the highway noise to the accepted levels.  5. We request the establishment of a section of I-70 from one mile west through one mile east of exit 218 that prohibits the use of engine brakes (Jake Brakes) on all diesel vehicles.  6. We request a reduction in the speed limit throughout the area noted in number five above.	Online

Robert F. Potter  
Catherine A. Potter

Categorized Comment	ID	Author	Category	Date	Text	Status
Categorized Comment	205	Prendergast, Mike	Public	2/23/2005	<p>Comment on Mountain Corridor Project:</p> <p>More lanes will cause health impacts, especially from auto and truck air pollution</p> <p>The historical properties and cultural values of the corridor will be destroyed and lost forever or severely damaged; use will be impaired by noise and other environmental impacts.</p> <p>The added highway noise will be intolerable for the residents in the area and the tourists who come to enjoy Colorado communities and out-of-doors.</p> <p>Noise reduction with sound walls will mean that people in cars can't enjoy the scenery and people outside of the highway will have to see the ugliness and visual degradation of the walls.</p> <p>Tourism will suffer during the 15 year construction period and afterwards because access will become so difficult for up to 15 years, and the Corridor will lose the pleasantness, historical attractions and environmental quality that brings tourism to Colorado.</p> <p>Safety can be improved with selected improvements; there is not need to pave more lanes for improved safety.</p> <p>CDOT appears to be making a decision based only on capital cost; environmental and social values are not used in this decision process and they should be the basis for sound decisions.</p> <p>We favor a High Speed Elevated Transit as the best solution for this Corridor, and it should be constructed instead of more highway lanes or a bus guideway.</p> <p>CDOT should have sought a "Corridor Vision" in the EIS process but did not.</p> <p>CDOT cannot afford to maintain the highways we have now so why build more that they cannot afford to maintain?</p> <p>More traffic and lanes means more damage to water quality, rivers, wetlands and wildlife habitat; we do not want this sort of damage.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	563	Price, Marcella	Public	5/23/2005	<p>I was born and raised in Colorado. I am currently a resident of Silverthorne.</p> <p>Throughout the 23 years of owning property in Summit County, I have made hundreds of trips along the I-70 Corridor. As noted in the PEIS, a number of bottlenecks exist and, if corrected, would greatly decrease the potential for congestion. Short periods of peak traffic, combined with numerous insane drivers who exhibit no patience for the smallest amount of extra traffic, are the main problems. Alternatives that involve six lanes or one additional lane would be a disaster. In my opinion, the completed six-lane alternative would become the Speedway of the Rockies. While we welcome moderate growth in the tourist-related industry in Summit County, we do not need thousands of additional cars racing up and down the mountain.</p> <p>A greater problem, not adequately addressed in the PEIS, is the massive investment the mountain communities would have to make in larger parking areas and expanded local roads.</p> <p>I propose that Colorado seek a long-term solution with a non-highway mass transit system. The present general alignments and rights-of-way can readily accommodate a towered rail system. Environmental and other impacts would be minimal compared to an expansion of highway lanes. Construction could be orderly and completed much sooner than adding additional lanes. The greatest advantage, however, of mass transit is that it would avoid enormous traffic disruption over an indicated 15-year construction period of the highway expansion. By the end of 15 years, economy along the Corridor would be depressed, from which recovery would take decades.</p> <p>Please select an alternative of "fixing" a few choke points in the immediate future and then researching a mass transit system that will solve the traffic problem along the I-70 Corridor.</p> <p>Marci Price</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	751	Price, Marcella	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action - fix 'choke' points, modify travel demand (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>There seems to be more skiers now than there is places to park. With some incentives for other traffic to give way to the skiers during peak times, and fixing the bottlenecks, there should be adequate conditions for the systems. We do not need nor want 6 lanes of a two day a week raceway. Marci Price, marciprice@aol.com</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	777	Price, William	Public	5/18/2005	<p>The PEIS is a very limited and biased study. It has a cap on the spending amount and only considers initial capital cost without either O&amp;M cost or the impact of length of time for implementation. There is no evaluation of the impact of 6 lanes of cars arriving in Summit County which would clog our local systems and cars would have no where to park. Bill Price, wmaprice@aol.com</p> <p>(Comment added at end of Our Future Summit Survey)</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	562	Price, William	Public	5/23/2005	<p>I am a consulting engineer and registered Civil Engineer in the State of Colorado. I am a retired Principal Engineer from the World Bank and have assisted in evaluations of countless feasibility analysis and selection of final projects with a variety of civil engineering applications. While the World Bank does not demand borrowing country's use of the NEPA process nor Programmatic EIS (PEIS), they insist on rigorous economic and environmental analysis and evaluation of alternative components.</p> <p>The I-70 Mountain PEIS is complex in a variety of issues, terrain, potentially large environmental and social impacts and economic aspects. However the complexity of the real issues can readily be made to seem very difficult in order to frighten non-technical citizens from actively participating in the review process. By listing hundreds of references, identifying hundreds of somewhat-related factors, performing what is meant to appear as highly accurate modeling and predictions of future conditions can confuse the real issues. The PEIS seems to strive for this confusion while minimizing the quantification of the mitigation of potential impacts and then selecting then selecting the narrowed list of alternatives base on misguided assumptions.</p> <p>In my opinion, the presentation of maximum confusion was the primary objective of CDOT higher management. In the opening sentence of the PEIS executive summary, the authors state "The PEIS provides an independent and systematic process of developing and analyzing the need for - and associated effect of - transportation capacity alternatives for the I-70 Mountain Corridor." My rebuttal to that statement is to ask: Can anyone accept that (1) CDOT is capable of preparing an "independent" study? (2) The PEIS is "systematic" when a financial cap is basically used to eliminate numerous alternatives except for constructing more highway lanes? (3) "Developing and analyzing need" which normally means quantifying benefits, but no estimate or economic quantification is given (yet construction costs are estimated)? (4) the analysis is complete when very little is presented about the total cost of mitigation of the cumulative impacts?</p> <p>The PEIS refers to a 1998 study that recommended a high-speed transit system that would involve limited changes to the highway capacity. It appears that CDOT staff narrowed the alternatives to those that are either "do nothing" (mandated by NEPA) or build more highway lanes (in various configurations and amounts). I find it interesting that the conclusions of the I-70 Coalition made up of elected representatives and citizens along the Corridor are closer to the concept of the 1998 MIS than this PEIS. Does the possibility exist that the 1998 MIS (feasibility-type analysis) was more connected to the needs of the citizens along the I-70 Corridor than a politically-guided non-independent CDOT and was more reasonable about presenting a real feasibility analysis?</p> <p>The core of the CDOT PEIS seems to be with outlining and discussing "mobility evaluations." It states that complex models were used to predict traffic in 2025 and then used those results to develop alternatives that would be able to handle such traffic on the roads. Most of the alternatives involved highway lane expansions that are estimated to require a 15-year construction period. Citizens along the Corridor can well understand that about five years would be needed for final planning, right-of-way acquisition, final design and tendering construction contracts. That means construction could begin in about 2010. Add 15 years for the estimated construction period. Thus completion for a full non-obstructed roadway system would be 2025. The results would be that such up-grades would meet estimated traffic flow for only a few months. Then as traffic demand would continue to increase, the system just completed would be out-of-date and subject to renewed congestion slowing. That type of planning is not, in my opinion, very sound.</p> <p>I believe that the greatest weakness of the PEIS is that no effort has been made to assess the staggering environmental, social and economic impacts that will occur as a result of the slowed flow of traffic and significantly increased congestion caused during the 15 years of road construction. The technical report on "construction impacts" list numerous references of ways that the traffic flow impacts during construction can be reduced. However, most examples are for a shorter construction periods less than 15 years.</p> <p>In general, the more restrictions and conditions that are placed on construction contracts to avoid congestion, the greater the cost will be. While minimal or no restrictions could cost less, the congestion would likely be intolerable.</p> <p>In a typical feasibility analysis, those projects with short construction periods that allow full benefits to begin early are the ones with the highest Internal Rates of Return. With not having the full benefit until</p>	Online

after 15 years and with large negative benefits during those 15 years, the added highway lane alternatives would not stand up to traditional economic feasibility criteria.

As part of the mobility evaluations, the PEIS shows numerous charts with estimated travel times (after the 15-year construction). They present the times down to the minute as if the projections are highly accurate. I point to just on item that seems very questionable. Items like this, in my opinion, discounts any credibility of the travel time analysis. Table 2 -- 14 tells readers that for travel along a six-lane highway (westbound from C-470 to Glenwood Springs -- 144 miles), the 55 mph alternative would take 214 minutes while on the 65 mph six-lane alternative, the travel time is reduced by "one minute" to 213 minutes. One would think that a system designed for 65 mph instead of the same designed for 55 mph, there would be a much greater time saving than "one minute". One would also think that a 65 mph highway would allow an average speed of somewhere around 60 mph (one mile per minute). Thus a six lane 65 mile designed system should allow the trip to be made in about 144 minutes. So this PEIS is explaining to Colorado citizens who travel the I-70 Corridor, if we made the upgrades from 55 mph to 65 mph, one could save "one minute" travel time but would average only 40.5 mph overall on those brand new expanded highways!

The politically inspired "affordability" limit of \$4billion is an absolutely unacceptable method of developing alternatives or arriving at the most preferred alternative in subsequent PEIS stages.

Please allow a process that will investigate and evaluate high speed mass transit solutions that are now available internationally. Many potential solutions would have substantially less cumulative environmental, social and economic impacts than building a six-lane highway and by charging fares, would be partially self financed. The preferred alternative should be to fix a few "choke points" and look for long-range solutions with high speed mass transit that will provide a system that would meet the needs of the I-70 Corridor transportation for the next 50 years.

Sincerely, William Price, Silverthorne Colorado Resident.

Categorized Comment	96	Priegel, Amy	Public	1/31/2005	<p>As a Breckenridge resident, I am concerned about the I-70 corridor expansion plan. I encourage CDOT to look further than the "quick fix" of adding another lane (just because that is the cheapest option) and to have the long-term vision to choose an alternative with the best overall return on the investment. As a former (but brief) Denver resident and oftentime visitor, I look to I-25 as an example - for how long and for how much money has construction been carried out on that road, with congestion still so bad we will take any variety of alternate routes to avoid it? Recently the Denver voters approved what I think will be a better solution to their traffic congestion - the new light rail expansion, which I look forward to using when it's done!</p> <p>Also, thank you for holding the discussion meetings in the mountain towns - it's nice to know that we have a chance to voice our opinions and are not entirely at the mercy of front range travelers!</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	492	Primus, Constance	Public	5/13/2005	<p>Please limit construction first to major problem areas, such as the Twin Tunnels, then reasses the situation. Possible public transit should be incorporated in plans for the future. Please continue to get input from citizens of Silver Plume, Georgetown, and Idaho Springs.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	776	Psaila, Yvonne	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Widening the highway or building mass transit is like using a bulldozer to flatten a coke can. The solution is out of proportion to the dimension of the problem. I favor mass transit, but we should try buses in the existing lanes to see if we can change driver behavior before we invest in a costly mass transit system. Meanwhile, something should be done at the federal level about inter-state commercial traffic: invest in the rail system or spread traffic out across different inter-state routes to balance loads. Yvonne Psaila, ypsaila@netzero.net, 91099 Ryan Gulch Road, Silverthorne, 80498</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	451	Radamus, Aldo	Public	4/27/2005	<p>I believe the only forward thinking option to be the raised train option. Although the cost is higher than the other options, other solutions only place a band-aid on the problem and will add to deterioration of air quality while only moderately improving traffic capacity to meet growing needs.</p> <p>I strongly encourage you to proceed with a greater vision of what will be a long term solution to transportation along the I-70 corridor and having the courage to act with a visionary approach.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Aldo Radamus, Edwards</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	724	Raitano, Florine	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Buld mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monoral (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Why are we trying to plan transportation needs based on a 70 year-old paradigm? We need visionary leadership that will recognize that fossil fuel powered transportation will soon go the way of the dinosaurs (which provided the fossil fuel in the first place). We need to start implementing 21st Century solutions to our transportation needs. Yes, it is a Disneyland ride - but in an economy based on tourism, isn't that the point? Dr. Florine P. Raitano 408 W. LaBonte Dillon CO</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	639	Regional Transportation District	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/11/2005	<p>Regional Transportation District 1600 Blake Street Denver, Colorado 80202-1399 303/628-9000 RTD-Denver.com</p> <p>May 11, 2005</p> <p>Ms. Christine Paulsen Ms. Cecelia Joy Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Re: I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Chris &amp; Cecelia,</p> <p>RTD staff has reviewed the I-70 Draft PEIS document. The staff-level comments are as follows:</p> <p>1. Regardless of the transit technology and infrastructure cross section selected, RTD will naturally be interested in participating in Tier 2 studies which would further define the "Jefferson Station" interface between mountain and Denver region transit services. Jefferson Station is variously identified as being in the vicinity of I-70 and C-470 (p. 2-94). CDOT's identification of Tier 2 study completion dates of 2009 are especially critical, given that is the anticipated year for the West Corridor to begin construction.</p> <p>2. The travel time comparisons necessarily use averages. What needs to be highlighted is the reliability of travel speeds, or put another way to show the variances. The averages presented show that auto access to transit, plus travel in the transit corridor is slower than driving the whole way. With bus-in-guideway, and with the reversible HOV /HOT lanes, it would be expected that travel in those situations would have greater reliability (lower variance) than travel in general purpose lanes. Not highlighting this important distinction is to ignore the primary benefit of these alternatives.</p> <p>3. On the reversible HOV /HOT alternative, it seems implausible that the only access/egress points would be at the termini of the entire facility. For the reversible HOV /HOT alternative, the termini are Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnel (EJMT) and Hyland Hills, some 33-miles apart (p 2-48). If nothing else, some emergency access/egress points should be included in the event of an accident or other blockage somewhere along the 33-mile facility. Additionally, if the bus-in-guideway alternative can serve communities along the way (implied by text on p 2-36 and route structure diagram on p 2-38), the reversible HOV /HOT lane should also be capable of serving select intermediate locations (i.e. Idaho Springs and Georgetown). Lack of intermediate access/egress would inhibit the capability of buses to use the HOV/HOT lanes effectively.</p> <p>Please reconsider this definition either at this Phase 1 level or the forthcoming Phase 2 level of analysis.</p> <p>Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Rao Assistant General Manager, Planning &amp; Development</p>	Written

C: Bill Van Meter, Senior Manager of Systems Planning  
 John Shonsey, Senior Manager of Engineering  
 Dennis Cole, Engineering Design Manager  
 Dave Shealey, Manager of Corridor & Regional Planning  
 David Hollis, Manager of Corridor Planning, Modeling & Operations Analysis  
 Robert Rynerson, Senior Lead Service Planner/Scheduler (West Area)  
 David Krulsinger, Senior Transportation Planner

Categorized Comment	108	Rapp, Donald	Public	1/19/2005	<p>Thank you. My name is Donald A. Rapp, 9177 High Mesa Road, Olathe, Colorado 81425.</p> <p>I am the former Colorado State Director of Oil Shale Planning &amp; Coordination in the Office of the Governor, the senior energy policy planner to ten western state governors, a college director of research and multiple county planning director, senior visiting scientist for national energy policy research conducted for the U.S. Congress by the University of California at Los Alamos National Laboratory. My credentials are in the public record.</p> <p>I wish to pose several questions, and request that this paper be placed into the public record of this hearing (indicating).</p> <p>First, in view of well-documented declining asphalt resources in Colorado and across the United States, why has CDOT assumed an unending supply of asphalt material and thus failed to incorporate an assessment that evermore costly asphalt paving repairs and resurfacing will most likely need to be totally replaced by another form of paving material within the next 50 to 75 years?</p> <p>Why doesn't CDOT give the state legislature and the general public a full cost comparison of proposed asphalt highway construction with other transportation options and payment plans now in their possession?</p> <p>2. In a related matter, why has CDOT assumed a 20-year cost comparison for only 38 miles of highway expansion versus high-speed monorail?</p> <p>Why doesn't CDOT consider a true cost comparison over the 75-year life span of high-speed monorail structures versus the costly construction, tunneling, and paving repairs and replacement, as cited in question 1, for the entire 160 miles?</p> <p>3. Why would CDOT propose a partial solution of any kind that fails to address traffic congestion between Denver and Summit County Airport at Eagle, Colorado, the full 160 miles, especially when it is already apparent that the proposed 38-mile solution merely moves the traffic choke point?</p> <p>4. Why has CDOT failed to fully assess the socioeconomic impact and costs of highway construction of the proposed 38-mile construction area and its related impact on all of western Colorado?</p> <p>More significantly, why has CDOT failed to do a full assessment of the socioeconomic impact and cost comparison between highway expansion and a high-speed monorail system over a 75-year time frame?</p> <p>In the absence of all information, how can CDOT or the public make an informed decision?</p> <p>And 5. Why has CDOT resorted to less than complete research practices and costing and payment models that seem to demonstrate predetermined biased conclusions when compared to proven high-speed monorail technologies and defensible studies they have in hand?</p> <p>Why doesn't CDOT use comprehensive research models used elsewhere in the United States before seeking public comment?</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Transcripts

Categorized Comment	139	Rapp, Ed	Public	1/12/2005	<p>For the record, my name is Edward G. Rapp of Dumont, Colorado. I'm an engineer and a retired Army officer, college professor and county commissioner. I hold an appointment with the Minerals, Energy, and Geology Advisory Board for the Department of Natural Resources. And as such, my credentials and resume are a matter of public record.</p> <p>This evening I have a single, albeit complex, question to read into the record: A Question of Indictment.</p> <p>Why did you, CDOT, select a small firm excluding all other competition to conduct a major PEIS that is 50 times greater in magnitude than that firm's prior experience, and to what degree were Small Business Administration rules to protect other business from improper incursion into free enterprise and interstate commerce compromised, and to what degree was the PEIS manipulated by a dominant client/consultant relationship; and</p> <p>why did you reduce the planning horizon for this analysis from 50 to 20 years thus biasing the analysis toward solutions with short design lives, e.g., pavements; and</p> <p>why did you segment the distances of the study thus also favoring incremental rather than comprehensive solutions; and</p> <p>why did you collect only limited anecdotal traffic data when you stated publicly that the information would not be adequate for use in modeling, then with duplicity used that data for the critical traffic demand analyses; and</p> <p>why did you create then deliberately subvert the critical TDM model such that the outputs are not reproducible or verifiable; and</p> <p>when did FHWA first know about the intellectual dishonesty in the use of the model?</p> <p>I'll continue later.</p> <p>Why have you persisted in a fallacious cost comparison of 38 miles of highway widening which do not meet the original stated purpose and need for the PEIS versus the 160 miles of high speed monorail [e.g. CHSST] or its equivalent that does not meet the purpose and need; and</p> <p>why has the original purpose and need statement been modified if not to accommodate a short term incremental highway widening solution; and</p> <p>why have you suppressed from public view and general knowledge of the feasibility data known to you about the CHSST and other deployable high speed monorail systems; and</p> <p>why did you fail to consider high speed monorail fundability using a public purpose corporation, its commercialization potential, its freight potential, its utilities transmission potential and other emerging funding sources, when speculative sources were used in other alternatives.</p> <p>I'll continue later.</p> <p>Continued: Jo Ann Sorensen donated her time to Mr. Rapp.</p> <p>And why did you arbitrarily and capriciously set a \$4 billion ceiling on affordability when considering systems and modes with very different design lives, life-cycle cost factors, fundability profiles, impacts and long term benefits; and</p> <p>why were cumulative construction period mobility, environmental, economic, and social impacts not a factor in the decision processes comparing other alternatives to AGS; and</p> <p>why has the public not been told of the 15 year, year 2010 to 2025, mobility constraints which also result in cumulative social and economic impacts in the Mountain Resort Region, and subsequent impacts on the Front Range; and</p> <p>why have you suppressed known historical cultural impacts from public view under the guise of a future Tier II analysis thus biasing results toward highway widening; and</p> <p>why have you failed to alert the public to known environmental hazards existing in the I-70 right of way, e.g. mercury, arsenic, lead, cadmium and other amalgam residuals left over from ore processing at 23 historic mill sites; and</p> <p>why have you not disclosed to the public that highway widening presents a 47 times greater chance of uncovering and mobilizing these amalgam materials than is presented with the construction of monorail stanchions; and</p> <p>why have you failed to note the potential water quality impacts and treatment costs, business impacts on downstream communities and industries accustomed to and dependant on Rocky Mountain spring water; and</p> <p>why have you failed to examine the continued availability of asphalt over the 75- year cycle of the highway system you propose;</p> <p>and why have you failed to examine the cumulative impact of this I-70 widening on other HUTF needs for asphalt everywhere for county roads and state highways where a high speed monorail option is not feasible and available; and</p>	Transcripts



why have you failed to make a true actuarial analysis of the costs of safety in lives among alternatives at critical chokepoints such as Kernits; and

why have you continued in public statements to define high speed monorail as "Pie in the sky" when you have in your possession, since June 2004 but have not yet released to the public, a Federal Transit Administration document as extensive as the I-70 PEIS that concludes that the CHSST system being deployed in Japan is feasible and immediately deployable in this corridor, and -- I will continue later.

Continued: Robby Hodge donated time to Mr. Rapp.

I'm Robby Hodge from the town of Georgetown. And I think Ed has said everything that I need to say. I've got an official letter from the board of selectmen that we entered. Go ahead, Ed, finish me up.

Ed Rapp Continued: Why has FHWA allowed the release of this draft PEIS with no travel time and congestion information, years 2010 to 2025, and no impact analysis except following the completion of construction nominally 2025, knowing that no jurisdiction can make a rational choice and comments about alternatives without being provided these essential elements of information; and

why has CDOT not modeled comparatively the cumulative impacts to the State's economy of impaired mobility during construction of at-grade modes versus the elevated off-line impacts of AGS; and

why have you failed to be responsive to the public wants or to build a consensus that meets the original stated purpose and need for this PEIS when such a consensus existed in 1999 at the end of the I-70 MS if not to fallaciously and arrogantly push forward a biased environmental impact statement that frustrates the intent of the National Environmental Protection Act in order to move quickly to a Record of Decision thus fulfilling a campaign promise made by this administration to the highway only interests of the State?

The consistent pattern of duplicity coupled with motive highlighted above should create reasonable doubt of the integrity and cause for an Inspector General investigation from Washington, D.C.

I hope that the problems uncovered are not malfeasance or conspiracy to commit fraud but an organizational culture gone awry to please the boss.

In any case, the public needs to know the NEPA essential elements of information so that we can rationally, rather than emotionally, comment. To that degree the process and the product have failed.

Continued: Comment made at end of public hearing.

I want to shift gears from the shock treatment that you got, and we were very serious in that shock treatment. We plan to pursue that course of action. What I want you to know is that we are not obstructionists. And you are not that evil. You are good people. The difference between us is an institutional culture versus our culture here. We have to live and work and raise families in these mountains and maintain them for our future generations. The big differences between us are, I think, in two philosophies: The first philosophy has to do with throughput. When highwaymen think of throughput, they think in terms of cars. When we think of throughput, we think in terms of people, goods, and services in a full range of moments.

The other philosophy has to do with construction periods. When you think of a construction period, that is something you get through to get to the end. And the statement is "trust us," but when the construction period becomes 20 years, and, actually, we would begin with the early action items in 2005, or very soon, so it might be in as much as that full 20 years, we think in terms of that as an ozone period that is a separate federal action that deserves its own environmental impact statement because it is on mobility, economics, and environment. And therefore, we are insisting that before you go for record of decision, you need to do that mobility analysis.

The last difference between us is a failure to examine sustainability, sustainability in each mobile system all through the end of the design life of the major structural components. Now, that's easily 75 years. Sustainability is the criterion we now have to move toward, and it's not available.

And I urge you that we need to try to narrow the gap in these three philosophies to come to consensus to be able to choose the proper solution for this very important corridor.

Thank you.

Categorized  
Comment

107

Rapp, Ed

Public

1/10/2005

January 10, 2005

Written

David A. Nicol,  
Division Administrator  
FHWA  
12300 West Dakota Avenue  
Lakewood, CO 80228

Tom Norton  
Executive Director  
Colorado Department of Transportation  
4201 E. Arkansas Avenue  
Denver, CO 80222

To Messrs. Nicol and Norton:

RE: Draft I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS)

It is truly unfortunate that the Draft PEIS has been released at this time. This document is deficient in process and content, as well for meaningful public and local governmental involvement. The following questions detail these technical deficiencies and apparent transgressions.

Why did the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), select a relatively small and inexperienced firm, outside the competitive bid process, to conduct a major PEIS that is fifty times greater in magnitude than that firm's prior experience, and to what degree were Small Business Administration rules circumvented?

Why was the planning horizon for this analysis reduced from 50 years to 20 years, thus biasing the analysis toward solutions with short design lives, e.g. pavements? This shortened planning horizon also served to effectively eliminate stand alone transit options as viable alternatives. Is this a violation of NEPA?

Why have the distances of the analysis been segmented thus favoring incremental rather than comprehensive solutions? Is this not a violation of NEPA?

Why was only limited traffic data collected when it was stated publicly that this information would not be adequate for use in modeling, and then CDOT reversed itself and used that data for the critical traffic demand analyses?

Why was the critical input data for use with the TDM model altered such that the outcomes are not reproducible and verifiable? Was the Peer Review Committee released from service because they pointed this out?

At what date did the FHWA first know about the intellectual dishonesty of both the process and the model, and what actions were taken before and during the legal sufficiency review by FHWA to correct misuses of both the input data and the altered models?

Why has FHWA allowed CDOT and JF Sato to utilize the fallacious cost comparison between 38 miles of highway widening, which does not meet the original stated purpose and need for the PEIS, and 160 miles of high speed monorail, e.g. CHSST, or its equivalent, that does meet the stated purpose and need of the PEIS?

Why has the original purpose and need statement been modified if not to accommodate a short term incremental highway widening solution?

Why has the feasibility data known by CDOT, FHWA, and the FTA about CHSST Colorado 200 and other deployable high speed monorail systems been excluded from use in the model and the selection of alternatives in the PEIS?

Why was potential high speed monorail funding using a public purpose corporation, its commercialization potential, its freight potential, its utilities transmission potential and other emerging funding sources, eliminated from consideration when those speculative sources were included for other alternatives?

Why was an arbitrarily and capriciously \$4 billion ceiling set on affordability when considering systems and modes with very different design lives, life cycle cost factors, funding profiles and long term public benefits? Then knowing public sentiment, why did you remove this viable alternative from the preferred mix of alternatives, if not as an act of political power?

Why was environmental, social and cumulative construction period mobility impacts not a factor in the decision process that eliminated AGS from the mix of preferred alternatives?

Why has the public not been told of the magnitude of mobility constraints and resulting cumulative social and economic impacts on Clear Creek County and The Mountain Resort Region covering the

extended fifteen year construction periods of highway options?

Why were known historical impacts eliminated from consideration for the Draft PEIS alternative selection under the guise of a future Tier II analysis? This has had the obvious effect of biasing the analysis in the Draft PEIS toward incremental highway widening.

Why have you failed to alert the public to known environmental hazards that continue to exist in the I-70 right of way, e.g. mercury, arsenic, lead, cadmium and other amalgam residuals remaining from ore processing at 23 historic mill sites? Were the costs of remediating these contaminants included in cost estimates for each of the at grade alternatives considered?

Why has it not been disclosed to the public that highway widening presents a 47 times greater chance of uncovering and mobilizing these amalgam materials than is presented by the construction of monorail stanchions?

Why did the Draft PEIS fail to note the potential water quality treatment costs and business impacts on downstream industries and communities accustomed to and dependent on pure Rocky Mountain water? Could the release of these known contaminants constitute a taking of adjudicated use?

Why did the Draft PEIS fail to examine the cumulative impact of an I-70 highway widening on asphalt availability statewide for county roads and state highways where a high speed monorail option is not feasible and available in light of the known backlog of maintenance and repair and the futurity of those materials vis-à-vis oil reserves over the 75 year design life of the structures to be designed and built?

Why did the Draft PEIS fail to make an actuarial analyses of the costs of safety in lives lost and injuries sustained comparing incremental highway widening and AGS options particularly at the interchange at Kermits and other known choke points?

Why has CDOT been allowed to continue to make public statements that define high speed monorail as "Pie in the sky" when it has had in its possession since June 2004 but has yet to release to the general public a Federal Transit Administration document (FTA-CO-26-7002-2004) which is to me more credible than the Draft I-70 PEIS, and which concludes that a CHSST system being deployed in Japan is feasible and immediately deployable along this corridor? Is this information being deliberately withheld from general public knowledge because it is counter to your obvious institutional bias for incremental highway widening?

Why have the FHWA and CDOT allowed the PEIS to be released in draft form with economic analyses that only portray impacts following completion of construction, nominally year 2025? Are the cumulative costs and impacts over a 15 year cone zone period (years 2010 to 2025) on property values of such a magnitude as to constitute a taking through major portions of Clear Creek County?

Why has CDOT not modeled comparatively the cumulative impact to the State's economy of impaired mobility during construction of at-grade modes versus the off line impacts of AGS?

Why have both the FHWA and CDOT, through their consultants, failed to act responsively to public desires to build a preferred alternative that meets the original stated purpose and need for this PEIS? And why have you failed to establish any semblance of consensus when such consensus existed following the I-70 Major Investment Study?

Why is the failure to assess construction impacts of a multi billion dollar Federal action spanning 15 years, 38 miles and expose that information to public scrutiny prior to a Record of Decision not a violation of NEPA in intent if not within the letter of the law or those regulations that have the force of law?

How can any jurisdiction in Colorado make a rational choice or comment on the full range of alternatives when the impacts years 2005 to 2025 are not known to them by this document?

This draft PEIS is a clever facade of legal sufficiency and a reflection of an institutional culture that knows highways only.

To fallaciously and arrogantly push forward a biased environmental impact statement not only violates the intent of the National Environmental Protection Act, but announces the intent to move quickly to a Record of Decision, which appears only to fulfill a campaign promise made to highway interests and does not serve the citizens who persevere, raise families, provide stewardship, and build economies in these most confined and endangered mountain places.

The pattern of institutional mendacity and duplicity highlighted by the foregoing questions should cause an inspector general investigation from Washington D.C. which may in fact find a basis to indict the authors for malfeasance in office and or conspiracy to commit public fraud.

This letter constitutes a formal, written response to the Draft I-70 West Mountain Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. I expect to receive written responses to each of the questions I have posed. In addition, I am willing to meet with any federally commissioned investigator to discuss each question in detail.

Respectfully yours,

Edward G. Rapp P.E.  
Col USA ret.  
PO Box 143  
Dumont, CO 80436

Cc: Congressman Mark Udall  
Congressman John Salazar  
Senator Wayne Allard  
Senator Ken Salazar  
Director, EPA Region VIII

Categorized Comment	111	Rapp, Ed	Counties	1/19/2005	My name is Edward G. Rapp, I'm the Clear Creek County Engineer, and I'm here representing the Clear Creek County Board of Commissioners.	Transcripts
					<p>The commissioners wish me to put into the record copies of letters signed and mailed to our congressional legislators in Washington, D.C., and others, for a call for an investigation.</p> <p>The commissioners state that there is reasonable grounds for such an investigation, and enclose 24 points of apparent errors, omissions, and other transgressions in this PEIS process and document.</p> <p>I have additional copies of these letters if members of the public or the press desire this information.</p> <p>The commissioners have noted that last week CDOT finally released the Federal Transit Administration document FTA-CO-26-7002-2004, titled The Colorado Maglev Project, dated June 2004.</p> <p>The commissioners are dismayed that as recently as 9 December, 2004, CDOT refers to this analysis as, quote, pie in the sky, unquote, when they know that this deliberately misleads the public from the truth.</p> <p>So that the public might judge for themselves, the commissioners respectfully request that copies of this document, FTA-CO-26-7002-2004, be placed in each library, where the draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, PEIS, has already been made available to the public for review and comment.</p> <p>This is appropriate, because the PEIS was used by CDOT as the cost match for the federal funds used in the Federal Transit Administration study. Thus, the study is an integral part of the PEIS process.</p> <p>I have copies of this study that I will show to anybody who wishes to see that in the rear of the room. I'll make available these copies should anybody in the audience wish to see it, and discuss the feasibility of high-speed monorail.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
Categorized Comment	173	Rapp, Ed	Associations & Special Interest Groups	1/15/2005	<p>My name is Edward G. Rapp of Dumont, Colorado. I am a registered professional engineer and appear here today as the president of the Clear Creek County Watershed Foundation. Our mission is the Good Samaritan cleanup of Clear Creek with EPA and others. With me is Christine Bradley, the Clear Creek County archivist.</p> <p>At the first public hearing, 12 January, I placed into public record "A Question of Indictment," which outlines 24 points of apparent errors, omissions, and transgressions in this I-70 West Corridor PEIS document and process. That document is being passed out now. On the back of the document, page 2, are circled three issues that I wish to expose in further depth given the time constraints of this hearing's rules.</p> <p>Question: Why has CDOT failed to expose to the public their knowledge and scrutiny of 23 mill sites in or immediately impacting the I-70 right-of-way if not as a ploy to avoid being a "potentially responsible party" under CERCLA? In earlier CDOT studies, this was believed to be a showstopper issue for general highway widening outside the guardrails. Why did CDOT choose to ignore this and leave it out</p>	Transcripts

of the draft PEIS? FHWA, when did you become aware of this potential liability issue? Since these are orphan sites, there is no responsible party unless someone knowingly disturbs these mill tailings.

Question: What happens when CDOT rebuilds and widens the roadbed? Can you assure the public that this disturbance will not release known contaminants of mercury, arsenic, cyanide, copper, cadmium, and other amalgam and ore residuals into the headwaters of a major drinking-water source? If such a release were to occur, could that also be construed as a "taking" of adjudicated rights of use by Thornton, Northglenn, Westminster, Golden, Coors, and others, or as a class action by citizens? Such losses could easily be billions of dollars and could significantly impact the state's economy.

You want Chris to pick up here, or do you want me to? She's just going to read what I've got here. Which would you like?

Continued:The existence of these mill sites is undeniably known to CDOT. But for the general public -- and for you in the general public, attached is a list of these sites, and I'll get this to you. And they're here -- this shows the patented names and the locations. The draft PEIS, pages 4-50 to 4-68, shows maps and some photographs of the area where these mill residuals exist but do not indicate the mill sites or highlight the hazards. To that degree, the maps avoid the issue. The archives of Clear Creek County and the state contain data and many historical photographs. We brought some reprints along today and submit those for the record. Most of these sites occur in the narrowest parts of the valley and along the streams within the towns because that is where hydropower was most easily developed. These are precisely the chokepoints through which highway widening would take place.

Categorized Comment	232	Rapp, Ed	Public	1/26/2005	My name is Ed Rapp. My questions concern the macroeconomics of this proposed federal action.	Transcripts
					<p>Question: Why has CDOT not presented the true and total costs of the proposed highway widening to the taxpayers of Colorado and the people of the I-70 corridor? From chart 3.9-17, the reader is forced to interpolate costs through year 2025. The first cost for highway is \$2.2 billion for road construction in 2010. This construction induces a cone zone recession for over 15 years that costs approximately \$15 billion in gross regional product in the nine-county mountain region.</p> <p>Plus, there is a local issue to provide more parking spaces to handle the additional cars. The \$15 billion will cost the state several billion in lost taxes and revenues. The bill to the state then is about \$4.2 billion for highway costs and lost revenue. Cost to the economics of the nine-county mountain region is about \$15.2 billion. The major bill payers are Summit, Eagle, and Grand counties. The highway alternatives are all pain, no gain through the year 2028.</p> <p>Question: Why have you hidden from the public view the returns available to the state by an early deployment of the monorail CHSST or its equivalent? The FTA study shows a six-year construction period for monorail that could begin as early as 2008. Since the major feature is constructed off-line, the existing highway is not impaired during construction. The early deployment first costs are, according to the PEIS, \$6.6 billion. The early deployment economic gain is approximately \$55 billion between years 2014 and 2025.</p> <p>Financing a \$6.6 billion investment that produces a \$55 billion gain in the first 15 years and continues the return on investment for the system design life of 75 years is a no-brainer. There is no affordability issue. The gain is measured in business success, employment, personal income, improved tax base, recreation days, improved travel times, and improved movement of people, goods, and services, and in improved state revenues.</p> <p>This is already documented by the REMI model in the PEIS. And for those who still wish to drive, the road remains open, but with 40,000 less cars on the passes and in the tunnel backups and in parking lots over here.</p> <p>Question: Why would any rational decision maker involved in a Tier I transportation policy decision wish to inflict 20 years of pain costing \$4.2 billion in direct costs and lost revenue and a \$15 billion recession in Colorado recreation industry unless as a procurer for a powerful highway lobby?</p> <p>Clear Creek County figured this all out seven years ago. Anyone want a bumper sticker? "I-70 Monorail Now."</p>	

Categorized Comment	266	Rapp, Ed	Public	2/2/2005	Good evening. As I look around the room, I see an impressive amount of data, although superficial. As Jo Ann Sorensen pointed out, I see a paucity of analysis that is meaningful, and I see violations of law and ethics.	Transcripts
					<p>My name is Ed Rapp of Dumont. I've left with the court reporter a copy of my credentials and resume for the record. As an appointed member of this administration, you can consider me a whistleblower.</p> <p>This draft I-70 West PEIS is in substantial violation of NEPA standards and is not in conformance with the Administrative Procedures Act. It is not a -- it is a not so cleverly crafted facade of legal sufficiency and an abuse of discretion in a manner, and I quote the law, "not in accordance with law and procedure." It has all the earmarks of a, and I quote the law, "post hoc rationalization for a decision that has already been made," which is also a violation of law.</p> <p>You need to be aware that this I-70 draft PEIS is already a case study being recorded and under scrutiny for ethical behavior by a class at the Colorado School of Mines. As a part of the required curriculum, the class of ten senior and graduate students is doing research and analysis about what goes on here.</p> <p>Since you have not been forthcoming with answers to questions posed to you over the past four public hearings, this team, supported by five distinguished professors, is particularly focused on, first, the lack of vision for 50 years or more, the 20-year construction disruption not described in the analysis, and third, the ethics and legality of the process.</p> <p>The team of students represents all those disciplines taught -- almost all disciplines taught at the Colorado School of Mines. Among the professors is a former head of the environmental engineering, the acting head of engineering, which includes civil, mechanical, electrical, and engineering ethicist, the former head of the mineral economics and operations research systems analysis, and a former lawyer from the Department of Justice in Washington, D.C., who litigated cases in transportation and water law.</p> <p>This distinguished group intends to provide the needed answers to the particular questions posed by mountain communities. I will leave with the court reporter a copy of this course notice. The products of this work will be available prior to the closure of the public comment period. The existence of this course on this subject at this time is evidence of your failure to give the public a decision basis for their rational comment.</p> <p>Have you considered a supplement to this draft PEIS, and a second round of hearings and comments?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	

Categorized Comment	309	Rapp, Ed	Public	2/9/2005	The nightmare scenario will not happen.	Transcripts
					<p>My name is Ed Rapp. I'm from Dumont, and I too had a fascinating dream last night. In my dream, Senator Tom Norton and I were sitting in the courtesy bar at Coors. I was drinking a brew from pure Rocky Mountain Springwater and Tom was drinking a glass of stuff I did not recognize. He said it was Mag Chloride, brand name "Sublime Slime." It's a required drink at CDOT. Now, why do you suppose nobody there smiles?</p> <p>In my dream Tom said he read the Federal Transit Administration study and is adding a new "feasible and prudent" alternative to the mix. Seems he had a vision. To my shock it was not "we make it wider and blacker." His vision was to "create a more sustainable future for Colorado that saves the most magnificent and endangered places for future generations." Say amen.</p> <p>He says, "Right now we want to add non-construction safety items to the highway, make everybody happy, even the truckers. Then in 2008 we'll start the first leg of the monorail from the Hogback to Frisco." At \$17 million per mile for a guideway, that is just over \$1 billion. Say hallelujah.</p> <p>He says, "We will take that squat little CHSST right through the existing ventilation spaces in Eisenhower and Johnson Tunnels, we'll save billions of dollars in tunneling and a heap of time too, even helps with ventilation. In three years we will have added the equivalent of six lanes to the capacity and kept the highway open to boot. It adds 7 -- \$5 billion a year to the economy of Colorado when we would otherwise be messing around in court making lawyers rich." Say amen. Amen.</p> <p>Next, we help Summit Stage and ECO Transit and local networks get to Keystone, Breckenridge, Copper Mountain and Vail, or whichever trailhead or trout stream folks have as their destination. Get people where they want to go! Now, is that an astute politician, or what?</p> <p>"Then we add climbing lanes to make the campers and those interstate folks happy. Now, the immediate crisis is solved and it's only 2014. Oh, did I say we'll create an enterprise-funded public-purpose corporation to privatize the monorail? We will recoup the guideline bonds by leasing time slots on the system to provide carriers and take it on spur lines to Black Hawk, Winter Park, Breckenridge, or wherever the market will bear. That is Phase 1.</p> <p>In the next phase, we'll go from DIA to Golden and from Frisco to Gypsum, and eventually over Cottonwood Pass to the Roaring Fork Valley and Glenwood Springs. No telling where this might take us</p>	

by the year 2025." Say hallelujah.

Then he threw out his Mag Chloride, jumped up saying he had to go to the capitol to get a bill started to form the Colorado Monorail Authority. But he paused reflectively, CDOT, as the Department of Transportation already has the responsibility, the authority, and now the vision in law right now. What an opportunity for a national tipping point decision in the transportation sector.

Well, my three-minute dream was up. But I wrote it all down, and the cost is about \$2.3 billion, details to be provided later. This is feasible, affordable, prudent. Say amen, Senator Norton. I want you to build the vision, not the nightmare.

Categorized Comment	321	Rapp, Ed	Public	2/12/2005	<p>Thank you. I'm Ed Rapp, and I'm from Clear Creek County. I'm a retired Army officer, Corps of Engineers, retired county commissioner, retired professor at Colorado School of Mines. But unfortunately I've never been retiring. So I'm here tonight or this afternoon to talk to you.</p> <p>Over here on the board, you will see a chart like this that shows everything on it but the stuff in green. And it -- the stuff in green that I'm here this afternoon -- this PEIS is something that currently Clear Creek County must oppose vehemently because in this period from 2010 to 2025 is the 15-year construction period for all of the ground-based alternatives, all the highway, all the bus in guideway, all of the ground-based, 15 years cone zone. And 15 years of impact that affect the plans of the Front Range and affect very much the economies over here.</p> <p>On that chart there, this -- the no-action, if you did nothing, the nine county gross regional product would grow at this level but eventually would begin to taper off around the year 2025. If you start building any of the ground-based alternatives, pointing that chart over there, social and economic values, you have a \$15 billion detriment to the mountains, to the nine counties. What that does is it squeezes off the economy of the counties. And that's a detriment that we can't live with. In addition, it has all of the other environmental impacts there.</p> <p>If you started in 2008 and built a multimodal solution -- and this solution is not in any of the documents. This has been ignored. And this solution will require an amendment to the current PEIS process. If you built this multimodal solution, you would begin to get benefits immediately, according to this analysis and the model that was used in those charts. And you would produce a \$15 billion increase to the no-action.</p> <p>So the deal is, spend \$2.2 billion down here -- actually, \$2.6 billion down here to begin widening, take a \$15 billion hit, but you'll start to get well in the outyears. Or come down here and you begin to build high-speed monorail. And you have to spend -- if you went from DIA to Eagle County Airport, nominally, around \$6 billion. But you get a \$50 billion immediate return. Not only that, you never shut off the highway.</p> <p>So there's the issue that we're going to talk about. This is all contained in the FTA study. And I want -- anybody who has seen this or been involved, raise your hand. Okay. We have a couple. And I recognize them. But the rest of you have not seen this. This came out in June 2004. And if you will pass it around -- I'll show you. This is just the executive summary. I need to have these back because they're my personal copies.</p> <p>UNKNOWN: Better lock the door, then.</p> <p>ED RAPP: No. In there, you'll find out where you can get your own personal copy, and I'll recommend it to you. Moreover, it should be sent out by CDOT to everybody. But I'll get to that a little bit later. This is the alternative that's not there. Another thing that is not there in all of this documentation is a vision. What are we trying to accomplish in the long run? This vision that's stated is we are going to meet the purpose and needs that are described in the PEIS. But this is omitted. And this is very important. And we think this is the vision that should be there, while creating a more sustainable future for Colorado that serves the magnificent and the endangered places for future generations. That is not -- that premise is not in any of this documentation around the room.</p> <p>It is required by law, incidentally, because there are over 500 places protected by Section 106 and 4F analysis -- and these guys know what that is -- for all alternatives at this level, Tier 1, not postponed to Tier 2. So that all alternatives on the table, that analysis should take place. And it is required for all feasible and prudent -- that's what the law says -- alternatives.</p> <p>This PEIS intends to, and this decision process, screen out high-speed monorail for an arbitrary and capricious definition of "affordability." Okay.</p> <p>Here is the policy decision that we put forward. You start with 2005, 2008, and you meet and take care of the safety items in the highway, 2008, you can begin deploying AGS from the Hogback to Frisco, and you energize Summit Stage and others in that thing.</p> <p>AGS to Frisco is really a \$2.3 billion problem. It is a \$2.6 billion problem if you widen the highway. It is cheaper. But what it does is it bypasses alongside the highway and keeps the highway open. Now you can go back and you can do widening in critical places like the passing lanes going up the hill.</p> <p>Build the climbing lanes. 2011, you begin deploying AGS from Frisco to Minturn. You build the AGS over Vail Pass and deploy from Minturn to Gypsum. Then you can fix Dowd Junction and further west.</p> <p>Any time in this process, you can deploy AGS from DIA to the Hogback. And any time in this process, you should be planning AGS from Gypsum over to Carbondale, down to Glenwood, up to the -- up into Aspen.</p> <p>Colorado Monorail Authority needs to be created, a 6320 public purpose corporation, enterprise funded. This is for you, Jack. Commercialization model is in that FTA study but has not been developed. Cost recovery plan, tolls, and time slot leasing. That's what you'll get your money back for from fares, freight, and transmission lines through the station. And station special development districts. That's how you can recoup your money.</p> <p>The advantages. This alternative that has yet to be studied provides the best public safety, best life cycle benefit cost, the least interstate disruption, the best 106/4F protection, the least water quality impact, the least noise, air, land, wildlife impacts, the least demand for asphalt. Very important. We're going to run out of asphalt. We should be using asphalt where it is really needed, not here. Best all weather throughput, best controls for growth.</p> <p>So what? Where to from here? CDOT, you need to print and distribute that FTA study. CDOT and Sato, you need to study this as a viable alternative. It has to be added to the mix. CDOT and FTA, you need to complete task six, which is the commercialization.</p> <p>Already Colorado School of Mines and DU are doing a third-party analysis of this PEIS because it was built -- it was put together as a foregone conclusion, a forced march to a predetermined solution. And the mountain coalition, which is formed of 29 members, will continue their hearings and public information based around this as a preferred alternative.</p> <p>I'll be in the back of the room later on to answer any questions anybody might have.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	327	Rapp, Ed	Public	2/12/2005	<p>I would like to speak again.</p> <p>I would like to comment on goofy ideas. There comes a time when the goofy idea's not goofy anymore; that, in fact, you've come to a tipping point in history where this is being recognized around the world and being deployed around the world. You go to Europe, go to Japan, this is not a goofy idea. As a matter of fact, this that is being deployed overseas are U.S. designs, because we're so dominated by highways. And we're so put down by departments of highways that, in fact, in most states, there are no departments of transportation. This is not a goofy idea. That report that you have in your hand shows that, in fact, it is -- exists, it is deployable, and it has been analyzed for this particular corridor.</p> <p>There are three corridors in the United States being evaluated for immediate deployment of goofy ideas. This is the one that has the most support from the federal transit administration. And the funding is there to do it. We have to get beyond listening to Senator Norton saying pie in the sky when he knows that is a lie, and saying it's not affordable when he knows that is a lie. What you afford and what you don't afford is a matter of prioritization. And you come to a point where you have to decide that this is something that we in the mountains of Colorado cannot afford to be without.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	392	Rapp, Ed	Public	2/23/2005	<p>You all have seen this before, but they haven't. My name is Ed Rapp. I'm a retired chief financial officer for a multi-billion dollar engineering organization, in fact, the world's largest such organization.</p> <p>My focus is on the economics, and particularly the economics of the avoided alternative. This chart shows the economic impact of highway construction for all at grade alternatives. These are the current preferred group. There -- this is the red line of all of the preferred group --</p> <p>CECELIA JOY: Can we see it too? I'd like to see it too. Move it so we can all see it, please.</p> <p>ED RAPP: Well, let me give you copies, so then you can read along.</p> <p>CECELIA JOY: That's what's up there?</p>	Transcripts



Categorized Comment	816	Rapp, Ed	Associations & Special Interest Groups	1/15/2005	<p>15 Jan 05. My name is Edward G. Rapp of Dumont Colorado. I am a registered professional Engineer and appear here today as the President of the Clear Creek Watershed Foundation. Our mission is the Good Samaritan cleanup of Clear Creek with EPA and others. With me is Christine Bradley, the Clear Creek County Archivist.</p> <p>At the first public hearing 12 Jan 2005 I placed into the public record "A question of Indictment" which outlines 24 points of apparent errors, omissions and transgressions in this I-70 West Corridor PEIS document and process. That Document is being passed out now. On the back of the document (pg 2) are circled three issues that I wish to expose in further depth given the time constraints of this hearing's rules.</p> <p>Question: Why has CDOT failed to expose to the public's knowledge and scrutiny the 23 mill sites in or immediately impacting the I-70 right of way, if not as a ploy to avoid being a "Potentially Responsible Party" under CERCLA? In earlier CDOT studies this was believed to be a show stopper issue for general highway widening outside the guardrails. Why did CDOT choose to ignore this and leave it out of the draft PEIS? FHWA, when did you become aware of this potential liability issue? Since these are orphan sites, there is no responsible party unless someone knowingly disturbs them.</p> <p>Question: What happens when CDOT rebuilds and widens the road bed? Can you assure the public that this disturbance will not release known contaminants of mercury, arsenic, cyanide, copper, cadmium and other amalgam and ore residuals into the headwaters of a major drinking water source? If such a release were to occur could that also be construed as a "taking" of adjudicated rights of use by Thornton, Northglenn, Westminster, Golden, Coors and others or as a class action by citizens? Such losses could easily be a billion dollars and could significantly impact the State's economy.</p> <p>The existence of these mill sites is undeniably known to CDOT. But for the general public, attached is a list showing the patented names and locations. The draft PEIS (pages 4-50 to 4-68) shows maps and some photographs of the area where these mill residuals exist but do not indicate the mill sites or highlight the hazard. To that degree the maps avoid the issue. The archives of Clear Creek County and the State contain data and many historical photographs. We brought some reprints along today and submit those for the record. Most of these sites occur in the narrowest parts of the valley and along the streams within the towns because that is where hydropower was most easily developed. These are precisely the choke points through which highway widening would take place.</p> <p>It was for this issue that the Colorado Intermountain Fixed Guideway Authority was created because it was known at that time that an elevated monorail could be routed to avoid these sites. The public now knows of this issue and you CDOT and FHWA must address it with its full cost and health, safety, welfare ramifications including detriments and benefits among all alternatives prior to a record of decision.</p> <p>The public needs to know that the white hats working to maintain the health of this watershed are Coors, Henderson, the USFS, EPA, CDPHE, Clear Creek County, the Stanley Lake cities and others. We hold the road open and trust you do us no harm. We will not suffer to permit the rape of these waters and mountains.</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
Categorized Comment	795	Rapp, Ed	Public	1/12/2005	<p>12 Jan 05. For the record my name is Edward G. Rapp of Dumont, CO. I am an engineer and a retired army officer, college professor and County Commissioner. I hold an appointment on the Minerals, Energy, and Geology Advisory Board to the DNR and as such my credentials and resume are a matter of public record.</p> <p>This evening I have a single albeit complex question to read into the record.</p> <p>A QUESTION OF INDICTMENT</p> <p>Why did you, CDOT, select a small firm excluding all other competition to conduct a major PEIS that is 50 times greater in magnitude than that firm's prior experience, and to what degree were Small Business Administration rules to protect other business from improper incursion into free enterprise and interstate commerce compromised, and to what degree was the PEIS manipulated by a dominate client/consultant relationship, and</p> <p>why did you reduce the planning horizon for this analysis from 50 to 20 years thus biasing the analysis toward solutions with short design lives e.g. pavements, and</p> <p>why did you segment the distances of the study thus also favoring incremental rather than comprehensive solutions, and</p> <p>why did you collect only limited anecdotal traffic data when you stated publicly that the information would not be adequate for use in modeling, then with duplicity used that data for the critical traffic demand analyses, and</p> <p>why did you create then deliberately subvert the critical TDM model such that the outputs are not reproducible and verifiable, and</p> <p>when did FHWA first know about the intellectual dishonesty in use of the model, and</p> <p>why have you persisted in a fallacious cost comparison of 38 miles of highway widening which do not meet the stated purpose and need for the PEIS versus 160 miles of high speed monorail e.g. CHSST or its equivalent that does meet the purpose and need, and</p> <p>why has the original purpose and need statement been modified if not to accommodate a short term incremental highway widening solution, and</p> <p>why have you suppressed from public view and general knowledge the feasibility data known to you about CHSST and other deployable high speed monorail systems, and</p> <p>why did you fail to consider high speed monorail fundability using a public purpose corporation, its commercialization potential, its freight transmission potential, its utilities transmission potential and other emerging funding sources, when speculative sources were used for other alternatives, and</p> <p>why did you arbitrarily and capriciously set a \$4 B ceiling on affordability when considering systems and modes with very different design lives, life-cycle cost factors, fundability profiles, impacts and long term benefits, and</p> <p>why were cumulative construction period mobility, environmental, economic, and social impacts not a factor in the decision processes comparing other alternatives to AGS, and</p> <p>why has the public not been told of the 15 year (yr 2010 to 2025) mobility constraints which also result in cumulative social and economic impacts in the Mountain Resort Region, and subsequent impacts on the Front Range, and</p> <p>why have you suppressed known historical and cultural impacts from public view under the guise of a future tier II analysis thus biasing results toward highway widening, and</p> <p>why have you failed to alert the public to known environmental hazards existing in the I-70 right of way e.g. mercury, arsenic, lead, cadmium and other amalgam residuals left over from ore processing at 23 historic mill sites, and</p> <p>why have you not disclosed to the public that highway widening presents a 47 times greater chance of uncovering and mobilizing these amalgam materials than is presented by the construction of monorail stanchions, and</p> <p>why have you failed to note the potential water quality impacts and treatment costs and business impacts on downstream communities and industries accustomed to and dependent on Rocky Mountain spring water, and</p> <p>why have you failed to examine the continued availability of asphalt over the 75 year life cycle of the highway system you propose, and</p> <p>why have you failed to examine the cumulative impact of this I-70 highway widening on other HUTF needs for asphalt elsewhere for county roads and state highways where a high speed monorail option is not feasible and available, and</p> <p>why have you failed to make a true actuarial analysis of the costs of safety in lives among alternatives at critical choke points such as Kermits, and</p> <p>why have you continued in public statements to define high speed monorail as "pie in the sky" when you have in your possession since June 2004 but have not yet released to the public a Federal Transit Administration document as extensive as the I-70 PEIS that concludes that the CHSST system being deployed in Japan is feasible and immediately deployable on this corridor, and</p> <p>why has FHWA allowed the release of the draft PEIS with no travel time and congestion information years 2010 to 2025 and no impact analyses except following completion of construction nominally year 2025, knowing that no jurisdiction can make rational choices and comments about alternatives without being provided these essential items of information, and</p> <p>why has CDOT not modeled comparatively the cumulative impacts to the State's economy of impaired mobility during construction of at-grade modes versus the elevated off-line impacts of AGS, and</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments

why have you failed to be responsive to public wants or to build a consensus that meets the original stated purpose and need for this PEIS when such a consensus existed in 1999 at the end of the I-70 MS, if not to fallaciously and arrogantly push forward a biased environmental impact statement that frustrates the intent of the National Environmental Protection Act in order to move quickly to a Record of Decision thus fulfilling a campaign promise made by this administration to the highway only interests of the State?

The consistent pattern of duplicity coupled with motive highlighted above should create reasonable doubt of integrity and cause for an Inspector General investigation from Washington D.C. I hope that the problems uncovered are not malfeasance or conspiracy to commit fraud, but an organizational culture gone array to please the boss. In any case the public needs to know the NEPA essential elements of information so that we can rationally rather than emotionally comment. To that degree the process and product have failed.

Categorized Comment	796	Rapp, Ed	Public	1/26/2005	I-70 MACRO ECONOMICS	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
					<p>My name is Ed Rapp. My questions concern the macro economics of this proposed Federal action.</p> <p>Question: Why has CDOT not presented the true and total costs of the proposed highway widening to the taxpayers of Colorado and the people of the I-70 corridor? From Chart 3.9-17 the reader is forced to interpolate costs through year 2025. The first cost is \$2.2B for road construction in 2010. This construction induces a cone zone recession over 15 years that costs approximately \$15B in Gross Regional Product in the nine county mountain region.</p> <p>Plus there is a local issue to provide more parking spaces to handle the additional cars. The \$15B will cost the State several billion in lost taxes and revenues.</p> <p>The bill to the State is about \$4.2 B in costs and lost revenue. Cost to the economics of the 9 county mountain region is about \$15.2B. The major bill payers are Summit, Eagle and Grand Counties. The highway alternatives are all pain, no gain through the year 2028.</p> <p>Question: Why have you hidden from public view the returns available to the State by an early deployment of the monoral CHSST or its equivalent? The FTA study shows a six year construction period for monoral that could begin as early as 2008. Since the major feature is constructed off line, the existing highway is not impaired during construction. The early deployment first costs are \$ 6.6 B. The early deployment economic gain is approximately \$55B between years 2014 and 2025.</p> <p>Financing a \$6.6 B investment that produces a \$55B gain in the first 15 years and continue the return on investment for the system design life of 75 years is a no brainer. There is no affordability issue. The gain is measured in business success, employment, personal income, improved tax base, recreation days, improved travel times, and improved movement of people, goods and services and State revenues.</p> <p>This is already documented by the REMI model in the PEIS. And for those who still wish to drive, the road remains open but with 40,000 less cars on the passes and in the tunnel backups.</p> <p>Question: Why would any rational decision maker involved in a Tier 1 transportation policy decision wish to inflict 20 years of pain costing \$4.2B in direct cost and lost revenue and a \$15B recession in Colorado recreation industry unless as a procurer for a powerful highway lobby?</p> <p>Clear Creek County figured this all out seven years ago. Anyone want a bumper sticker? I-70 Monorail Now.</p>	
					<p>Impressive Data—Paucity of Analysis—Violations of Law and Ethics</p> <p>My name is Ed Rapp of Dumont. I have left with the court recorder a copy of my credentials and resume for the record. As an appointed member of this administration you can consider me a Whistleblower.</p> <p>This draft I-70 West PEIS is in substantial violation of NEPA standards and is not in conformance with the Administrative Procedures Act. It is a not so cleverly crafted façade of legal sufficiency and an abuse of discretion in a manner "not in accordance with law and procedure". It has all the earmarks of a "post hoc rationalization for a decision that has already been made" which is also a violation of law.</p> <p>The question is: was this done with or without malice of forethought? If there was no malice then the product results from incompetence or perhaps a distorted institutional culture that condones mendacity. If it was done with forethought then there is malfeasance or perhaps even conspiracy to commit public fraud. That is for future courts to decide.</p> <p>You need to be aware that this I-70 draft PEIS is already a case study being recorded and under scrutiny for ethical behavior by a class at the Colorado School of Mines. As part of the required curriculum this class of 10 seniors and graduate students is doing research and analysis about what goes on here.</p> <p>Since you have not been forthcoming with answers to questions posed to you over the past four public hearings, this team supported by five distinguished professors is particularly focused on the lack of vision, the 20 year construction disruption not described in analysis and the ethics and legality of the process.</p> <p>The team of students represents almost all disciplines taught at Mines. Among the professors is the former head of the environmental engineering, the acting head of engineering (civil, mechanical, and electrical), an engineering ethicist, the former head of mineral economics and operations research systems analysis, and a former lawyer from the Department of Justice in Washington D.C. who litigated cases in transportation and water law.</p> <p>This distinguished group intends to provide the needed answers to the particular questions posed by the mountain communities. I will leave with the court recorder a copy of the course notice. The products of this work will be available prior to the close of the public comment period. The existence of this course on this subject at this time is evidence of your failure to give the public a decision basis for their rational comment.</p> <p>Have you considered a supplement to this draft PEIS and a second round of hearings and comment?</p>	
					<p>The I-70 Vision Alternative</p> <p>My name is Ed Rapp from Dumont and I had a fascinating dream last night.</p> <p>In my dream Senator Tom Norton and I were sitting in the courtyard bar at Coors. I was drinking a brew from Pure Rocky Mountain Spring Water and Tom was drinking a glass of stuff I did not recognize. He said it was Mag Chloride, brand name— Sublime Slime—required drink at CDOT. Do you suppose that's why nobody here on the panel smiles?</p> <p>In my dream Tom said he read the FTA study and is adding a new "feasible and prudent" alternative to the mix. Seems he had a VISION. To my shock it was not "we make it wider and blacker" His vision was to "create a more sustainable future for Colorado that saves the most magnificent and endangered places for future generations". Say "Amen".</p> <p>He says: right now add non construction safety items to the highway-- make everybody happy even the truckers. Then in 2008 we start the first leg of the monorail from the Hogback to Frisco. At \$17M per mile that is just over \$1B. Say "Hallelujah."</p> <p>He says, we will take that squat little CHSST right through the existing ventilation spaces in Eisenhower and Johnson tunnels—saves billions of dollars in tunneling and a heap of time too—even helps the ventilation. In three years we will have added the equivalent of six lanes to the capacity and kept the highway open to boot. It adds \$5 billion dollars each year to the economy of Colorado when we would otherwise be messing around in court making lawyers rich. Say "Amen", "Amen".</p> <p>Next we help Summit Stage and ECO Transit and local networks get to Keystone, Breckenridge, Copper Mountain and Vail or which ever trailhead or trout stream folks have as their destination. Get people where they want to go! Now isn't that an astute politician or what?</p> <p>Then we add climbing lanes to make the campers and those Interstate folks happy. Now the immediate crisis is solved and it is only 2014.</p> <p>"Oh did I say we will create an enterprise funded public purpose corporation to privatize the monorail." We will recoup the guideway bonds by leasing time slots on the system to private carriers and take it on spur lines to BlackHawk Winter Park, Breckenridge or where ever the market will bear. That is Phase I.</p> <p>In the next phase we will go from DIA to Golden and Frisco to Gypsum and eventually over Cottonwood Pass to the Roaring Fork valley and Glenwood Springs. No telling where this might be by 2025. Say "Hallelujah, hallelujah".</p> <p>Then he threw out his mag chloride, jumped up saying he had to go to the capitol to get a bill started to form the Colorado Monorail Authority. But he paused reflectively, ---"CDOT already has the responsibility, authority and vision in law right now. What an opportunity for a National tipping point</p>	

decision in the Transportation Sector."

Well my three minute dream was up. But I wrote it all down and the cost is about \$2.3B, details to be provided later. Feasible, Affordable, Prudent. Say "Amen Senator Norton".

Build The Vision—Not The Nightmare

Categorized Comment	799	Rapp, Ed	Public	2/16/2005	16 Feb 2005. My name is Ed Rapp and I am from Dumont Colorado. I am an engineer and former chief financial officer for the US Army Corps of Engineers in Washington D.C. and as such am intrigued by the devious in this PEIS.	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
					My testimony tonight concerns Tolling I-70, a CDOT cash cow?	
					Questions of Indictment III	
					This is the third in a series of seven exposes. Tonight I have four additional questions to expose to what degree CDOT intends to toll the public's access to their mountains. Since we will not get answers until the Final PEIS a year or so from now maybe Congress and/or our Legislators might find out and tell us so that we need not speculate.	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For CDOT and FHWA: Do you have any intention of changing the purpose and need statement of this PEIS to include tolling? Or to make tolling the sole purpose?</li> <li>Under the Open Records Law (CRS 24-72-201 et seq), what communications exist among parties to this PEIS process and the Colorado Tolling Enterprise concerning tolling of I-70 West?</li> <li>Why does the PEIS finance plan consider only a six lane option? Why should we not believe that this is prima facie evidence of "a post hoc rationalization for a decision that has previously been made," a violation of law?</li> <li>If not for cash, why else is this administration advocating "imprudent" highway widening alternatives while ignoring a more "prudent" alternative that preserve and protect historic and other endangered places from "constructive use"?</li> </ul>	
					For you on the Front Range, your access to the mountains will be impaired with construction zone delays for 15 years (years 2010 thru 2025). Then we speculate that CDOT will toll the next generation (your kids) for the privilege of sitting with twice as many cars in new and bigger traffic jams.	
					This impaired access will cost the economy of the mountains \$15B dollars in gross regional product. For that, we too will be tolled in our daily comings and goings to the store, to school, to the doctor's office. But this is not a tax. Go figure. Then just say no.	
					This [hold up the document] Federal Transit Administration analysis of the I-70 corridor shows a better solution: I-70 Monorail Now. But alas my allotted three minute sound bite is up. So that is a subject for Expose #4 in Silverthorne next Wednesday. Hope to see you there.	
Categorized Comment	800	Rapp, Ed	Public	2/23/2005	Questions of indictment IV	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
					23 Feb 2003. My name is Ed Rapp. I am a retired chief financial officer for a multi billion dollar engineering organization, in fact the world's largest. My focus is on the economics of the avoided alternative.	
					This chart shows the economic impact of highway construction of all at grade alternatives. These are the current "preferred group." What is not shown in the PEIS are the results of a Monorail Now alternative. This alternative would include highway climbing lanes and some geometry improvements. The work could be started as early as 2008 and would begin significant payback by 2011 as shown on this chart. This was the preferred alternative from the Major investment Study and is now backed up by the FTA Colorado Maglev Project Final Report. The economic advantage of the Monorail Now option is obvious.	
					CDOTS offer is: buy my highway widening starting in 2010 for \$2.4B, take a \$15B economic hit in the mountains until 2025 during 15 years of construction. Then in 2025 take delivery of a brand new 6 lane toll road.	
					The Monorail Now option is: Buy monorail in three \$2B stages beginning in 2008 and start getting a return on investment in 2011 that amounts to an economic boost to the mountains of \$50B by 2025. CDOT why didn't you analyze this alternative in the first place? You can still do it before May 24.	
					As a result of the FTA project you have a commercialization model to examine the affordability, the financing, the marketing and the cost recovery for any transportation system. It is a cradle to grave economic analysis tool. But alas you have not even opened the software. Why? A group of students at the Colorado School of Mines as part of an Engineering Public Policy Case Study of this PEIS have opened that software and they are using it. They will finish a third party analysis in the format of a Supplemental Draft PEIS before the end of the comment period. If you can't, they will.	
					The economic analysis and financing plan that you do have in the PEIS are grossly deficient. Use the model. Show the public real cost comparisons over time, using accepted benefit cost measures. And then try to defend your preordained outcome to build yet another multi billion dollar highway project. CDOT, you have not served the Governor or the public well by avoiding the obvious.	
Categorized Comment	801	Rapp, Ed	Public	2/26/2005	I am Ed Rapp of Dumont, Colorado. I keep hearing key words in these hearings.	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
					- 'car culture', can't change it. - need 6 lanes (no matter what the pain or cost.)	
					It seems like puppets reading from the same "3x5" card. The question for the press is who are the puppet masters and who are 'the behind the scene' Directors?	
					I title this piece 'Question of Indictment VI, Antitrust'	
					There is nothing new but the history you don't know.	
					We need to put in the record that there exists a lineage to our Colorado highway lobby and 'car culture' from the time of the antitrust case of 'US vs. Capitol City Lines' to the present.	
					Now I am not accusing anyone of an antitrust violation but I am serving notice that in the proceedings of this PEIS and Record of Decision antitrust laws and arguments may likely become germane.	
					To the Federal Highway Administration if you want to know where we are going with this, start with the Bradford C Snell Report to Congress of 1974 and bring it up to date.	
					Thank you, that is all I need to say at this time.	
Categorized Comment	814	Rapp, Trudy	Public	1/26/2005	Question of indictment II	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
					26 January 2005. My name is Trudy J. Rapp of Dumont, Colorado.	
					My concern is for historic sites and your apparent violation of the law pertaining to their protection. Why has CDOT failed to conform to Department of Transportation requirements, NEPA requirements and the Provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act as follows?	
					Your comment on page ES-37 of the draft PEIS has the issue backwards and is in substantial error. These protected places have already been designated as "significant." That is not your agency's decision to make. Nor is it within your "discretion" to postpone section 4(f) analyses until after a tier I Record of Decision.	
					All of the highway widening alternatives make "constructive use" of protected properties. The proximity impacts are believed to be so severe that the historical setting or other protected uses are substantially impaired through vibration, noise, air, water, land use or other degradations.	
					The law requires that these impacts be evaluated early in the development of the action when the wide range of alternatives is under study. The law specifically prohibits the agency from "arbitrarily or capriciously" eliminating any alternative to avoid the full protection provision.	
					The law also speaks to and prevents "a post hoc rationalization for a decision that has already been made." Your agency has widely paraded the decision that AGS is dead based on a self created threshold of affordability. In doing so, your agency has abused its discretion and acted in a manner that is "not in accordance with law and procedure". The remedy is to perform the 4(f) analyses for each alternative including AGS and IMC before a record of decision. These systems are both "feasible and prudent". The case law is quite clear about this.	
					We call for an investigation by USDOT into possible malfeasance. We add to that a call for a third party	



technical and procedural review of the data and models used in developing this PEIS. This review should be conducted by the National Academy of Engineering and the National Research Council. The National Trust for Historic Preservation is believed to be an interested party.

Categorized Comment						
815	Rapp, Trudy	Public	2/9/2005	The Nightmare Scenario	Accompaniments to Oral Comments	
				<p>9 Feb 2005. My name is Trudy Rapp from Dumont and Oh Lord did I have a nightmare last night. In my dream a party was going on in an Executive suite in a fancy marble and gold-domed building. They were celebrating a political victory over "a bunch of mountain hicks". They had a signed Record of Decision titled "The Rape of Colorado's Most Endangered Place" that they were toasting.</p> <p>"Here is to many more lanes right up the middle of Clear Creek County. And we will pave right over the 23 hazardous mill sites, history and anything else in the way. The difference between power politics and public fraud is whether you win or lose. When you have FHWA, EPA and the Denver Press quietly in your pocket and lots of political do re me from the highwaymen you can pull anything off. So what's next?"</p> <p>The four step process. Step 1: Cone zone the highway for 15 years. That will throttle down the ski and second home industries in Summit, Eagle and Grand Counties by \$15B, and make 3 new ghost towns in Clear Creek County. But they will recover—maybe. Plan to keep the filling stations, convenience stores and maybe a restaurant or two. Step 2: Take constructive use of one half of Idaho Springs and all of the Georgetown Silverplume National Historic Landmark District. Remember the look on that mayor's face when you said, "I have the authority to take your whole town". Step 3: Call out the paving train. Let's make it wider and blacker. Step 4: Start drilling tunnels and blow big chunks out of the mountains.</p> <p>Then some party pooper asked, "But what about the injunctions and the lawsuits?" "Who cares T Rex took most of the money anyway. The trick is make people think we are doing something. Make them think the other side is the obstructionist. Even though there is only one year left in this administration our widening policy runs for twenty years. In less than twenty years they have to repave the surface three times and begin the highway widening cycle all over again. The only change is that the choke points will have moved and the price of asphalt will be astronomical provided of course there still is oil and asphalt." Then they sang "Cars, cars, cars, cars, ain't it just delightful endless lanes of cars".</p> <p>With that ringing in my ears, I woke up. I reread the Draft PETS and guess what?</p> <p>The nightmare scenario is in fact CDOT's preferred policy option.</p> <p>CDOT, when will you learn? In these United States the power still lies with the people.</p>		
308	Rapp, Trudy	Public	2/9/2005	My name is Trudy Rapp from Dumont. And, oh, last night did I have a nightmare. In my dream a party was going on in the executive suite of a fancy marble and gold-domed building in Denver. They were celebrating a political victory over a bunch of country and mountain hicks. They had a signed record of decision entitled "The Rape of Colorado's Most Endangered Place," and they were toasting.	Transcripts	
				<p>"Here's to many more lanes right up the middle of Clear Creek County. And we will pave right over those 23 hazardous mill sites, history and anything else that gets in the way." The difference between power politics and public fraud is whether you win or lose. When you have FHWA, EPA, and the Denver Press in your pocket, along with the highwaymen, you can pull anything off. So what's next?</p> <p>The four-step process. Step 1: Cone zone the highway for 15 years. That will throttle down the ski and second home industry in Summit, Eagle, and Grand counties by \$15 billion and make three new ghost towns in Clear Creek County. But they will recover -- maybe. Plan to keep the filling stations, convenience stores, and a couple different restaurants.</p> <p>Step 2: Take constructive use of one half of Idaho Springs and all the Georgetown/Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District. Remember the look on the mayor's face when you said, "I have the authority to take the whole darn town."</p> <p>Step 3: Call out the paving train. Let's make it wider and blacker.</p> <p>Step 4: Start drilling tunnels and blow big chunks out of the mountains.</p> <p>Then some party pooper asked, "But what about the injunctions and the lawsuits?" Who cares, if T-Rex used most of the money anyway, the trick is to make people think we are doing something. Make them think the other side is the obstructionist.</p> <p>Even though there is only one year left in this administration, our widening policy runs for 20 years. In less than 20 years, they'll have to repave the surface three times and begin the highway widening cycle all over again. The only change is that the chokepoints will have moved and the price of asphalt will be astronomical, provided of course, there is still oil and asphalt.</p> <p>Then they sang, "Cars, cars, cars, ain't it just delightful, endless lanes of cars."</p> <p>With that ringing in my ears, I woke up. I reread the draft PEIS, and guess what? The nightmare scenario is, in fact, CDOT's preferred policy option.</p> <p>CDOT, when are you going to learn in these United States the power still lies with the people?</p>		
227	Rapp, Trudy	Public	1/26/2005	My name is Trudy Rapp, a Dumont resident.	Transcripts	
				<p>My concern is for historic sites and in your apparent violation of the law pertaining to their protection. Why has CDOT failed to conform to the Colorado Department of Transportation requirements, NEPA requirements, and the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act as follows:</p> <p>Your comment on page ES-37 of the draft PEIS has the issue backwards and is in substantial error. These protected places have already been designated as "significant." This is not your agency's decision to make, nor is it within your discretion to postpone Section 4(f) analyses until after a Tier I record of decision.</p> <p>All of the highway-widening alternatives make constructive use of protected properties. The property impacts are believed to be so severe that the historical setting or other protected uses are substantially impaired through vibration, noise, air, water, land use, or other delegations.</p> <p>The law requires that these impacts be evaluated early in the development of the action when the wide range of alternatives is under study. The law specifically prohibits the agency from "arbitrarily or capriciously" eliminating any alternative to avoid the full-protection provision.</p> <p>The law also speaks to and prevents a post hoc rationalization for a decision that has already been made. Your agency has widely paraded the decision that AGS is dead based on a self-created threshold of affordability. In doing so, your agency has abused its discretion and acted in a manner that is not in accordance with law and procedure.</p> <p>The remedy is to perform the 4(f) analyses for each alternative, including AGS and IMC, before a record of decision. These systems are both feasible and prudent. The case law is quite clear about this.</p> <p>We call for an investigation by the United States Department of Transportation into possible malfeasance. We add to that a call for a third-party technical and procedural review of the data and models used in developing this PEIS. This review should be conducted by the National Academy of Engineering and the National Research Council. The National Trust for Historic Preservation is believed to be an interested party.</p>		
552	Clear Creek Watershed Foundation	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/23/2005	Clear Creek Watershed Foundation P.O. Box 1963, Idaho Springs, CO 80452 tel: 303.567.2699 fax: 303.567.4337 email: ccwfoundation@clearcreekwireless.com	Written	
				<p>TRANSMITTAL MEMO</p> <p>TO: Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1</p> <p>FROM: Edward G. Rapp, CCWF President</p> <p>DATE: May 24, 2005</p> <p>SUBJECT: Response to I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS - CORRECTED LETTER</p> <p>On May 23, 2005, the Clear Creek Watershed Foundation submitted a Letter of Response to the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS electronically and via certified, return receipt mail. Due to several editorial errors in that version, we are hereby submitting the enclosed corrected version.</p> <p>Clear Creek Watershed Foundation P.O. Box 1963 Idaho Springs, CO 80452 tel: 303.567.2699 email: ccwfoundation@clearcreekwireless.com May 22, 2005</p> <p>Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) Region 1</p>		

18500 East Colfax  
Aurora, Colorado 80011

Re: Response to I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

CORRECTED

Dear CDOT:

The purpose of this communication is to provide public comment to the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS, December 2004. This is official agency comment from the Clear Creek Watershed Foundation made in addition to all previous comment.

The Clear Creek Watershed Foundation is a 501(c)3 dedicated to the health of the Clear Creek Watershed both ecologically and economically. We find that the prospect of six-lane widening through this watershed is the greatest threat to health, safety, and welfare faced in the last 100 years. CDOT is currently the largest industrial polluter in this watershed. This draft PEIS foretells of a huge cumulative increase of that effect.

We find significant policy assumptions hidden within the bowels of the document that are fallacious and not supported by fact. CDOT has not followed its own guidance contained in the CDOT Environmental Stewardship Guide. This begins with the environmental ethics statement and CDOT's mission statement and commission policies "to provide the best multimodal transportation for Colorado that most effectively moves people, goods, and information" and continues with Performance Based Transportation Investment Strategy Environmental Objectives. To wit:

- The manipulation of Tier I and Tier II analysis stymies the early detection of show-stopper issues such as conflicts with a National Historic Landmark District and residuals from historic milling of metals within the right-of-way. In both instances, the Tier I analyses were suspended when it became apparent that further analysis would favor elevated AGS in the form of CHSST or its equivalent over at-grade construction. It is known to CDOT that the right-of-way and "constructive use" impact zones contain many aspects that must be protected by law. This includes residual deposits of elemental mercury and cyanide not mentioned in the PEIS and which must not under any circumstances be mobilized into the waters of the United States. This contains many historic properties including the mining setting in which they are located that must be protected. Early analysis is required while the full range of alternatives is available. This is a requirement of CDOT guidance and law and it has not been done. Moreover, the draft PEIS makes a fallacious policy assumption that these aspects can be mitigated after the impairment by construction.

- The policy assumptions that all modes under consideration require the construction of the same length and size bore at Eisenhower/Johnson tunnels is fallacious. In fact, one or more modes actually fit in the ventilation spaces of the existing tunnels and can be configured to enhance ventilation from the highway pollution of cars and trucks in the spaces below. The policy assumption the FHWA and FTA cannot share the same facility is also fallacious.

- The cost comparisons make the fallacious assumption that modes of different design lives, different fundability profiles, and different physical lengths can legitimately be compared by first cost over a fixed 20-year period. Such a policy assumption borders on public fraud meeting the tests of: 1) knowingly false, and 2) an attempt to gain.

- Energy efficiencies are similarly computed on false premises. In fact, simple analysis performed by senior and graduate students at Colorado School of Mines shows that CHSST is five times more energy efficient in terms of passenger miles than highway efficiency.

- The impacts on mountain economies between early off-line construction of CHSST or equivalent compared to highway widening are not shown. The public was told that the model used for analysis could not break out county-by-county impacts and benefits when, in fact, current versions can. The 15-year cone zone depression brought on by highway widening through Clear Creek County can be avoided by early deployment of CHSST or its equivalent.

- The public statement by CDOT that "we do not do transit" is a digression to the old Colorado Department of Highways and is not consistent with the current mission statement.

- With regard to subsidies, our runs of commercialization model—owned by CDOT—shows that only the CHSST meets operational costs of 10¢ per passenger mile and at 15¢ per mile produces revenues of \$150M per year. CDOT investigates the economic revenue stream of tolling, but not commercialization of other modes, particularly when these models are available to you in house—why?

- Bias toward highway solutions is apparent throughout the document, as has been pointed out in other testimony.

- Full environmental costs are not included in any of the alternative analyses.

We can visualize CDOT playing out the scenario begun in this draft PEIS through to a Tier I Record of Decision. In some future court room, a judge would ask of CDOT:

The law forbids a "post-hoc rationalization of a prior decision;" the law prevents "arbitrary and capricious" assumptions and policy; the law prevents an abuse of power and discretion; the law requires a "hard look;" what part of this body of environmental law did you not understand?

It is our belief that mountain communities, particularly the entities in Clear Creek County, have put forward a reasonable and rational locally-preferred alternative that best meets public health, safety, and welfare considerations over a substantially longer life than is considered in the draft PEIS. It is this preferred alternative that should become the Record of Decision.

Sincerely,  
Edward G. Rapp, P.E.  
Clear Creek Watershed Foundation President

cmc/EGR

cc: Congressman Mark Udall  
US EPA Region 8, attn.: Deborah Lebow  
Federal Highway Administration, attn.: Jean Wallace  
Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, attn.: Water Quality Control Division  
Clear Creek County, attn.: Commissioners  
Upper Clear creek Watershed Association, attn.: Anne Beiler  
Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation, attn.: Peggy Stokstad

Categorized Comment	347	Raudzens, Adriana	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/16/2005	Thank you for this opportunity to comment tonight. My name's Adriana Raudzens, and I'm a representative of the Sierra Club here this evening. We have about 21,000 members in Colorado.  And as we're talking about the problem of congestion on I-70, I would ask that we revisit this problem before we start talking about the solutions. And the nature of that problem being, why are people traveling? Why are we cramming up the highway on our way out to the mountains and the Western Slope, especially on the weekends?  We're going out there because we're looking for opportunities to hike and camp in our national forests. We're looking for opportunities to go out to the mountain streams and fish. We're looking for opportunities to bike and hunt and ski our Rocky Mountain peaks. We're going out there to visit the historic communities along I-70 and appreciate the heritage -- cultural heritage that they bring to our state. And we're also sometimes just going out there for a breath of fresh clean air and a little rest from our busy urban life here on the Front Range.  So, as part of that, I would ask that when we consider a solution for the capacity along I-70, that we're not only thinking about how we bring more people out to these beautiful places, but make sure that we're also preserving the quality experience and quality of life for visitors and also for residents of the communities along the corridor because it's something we have to ask ourselves: In five years are we going to be asking for another highway expansion? In ten years will we be asking for 10 and 12 lanes?  So let me also just outline a few points of the Sierra Club official statement of decision on the I-70 draft plan. We have supported a fixed guideway transit system using rail technology and not fixed bus guideway. We do not support six-lane highway improvements, but rather, selected highway improvements along with enhanced bus operations to supplement a fixed guideway transit system.  Of course, we also support multimodal transfer centers, travel demand management, travel system management, enhanced air service, and in the consideration of alternative routes outside of the highway right-of-way as appropriate.  We would also like to encourage and support the development of a planning study to consider non-CDOT train alternatives. And we urge you very strongly to utilize all environmental criteria in the final screening analysis instead of just capital costs. We need to be able to take into account full environmental costs, quality of life, quality of experience issues, clean air issues. And if in the hearing or during comment period there are any public comments regarding the aspects of the environmental findings, the final PEIS should not be issued until the public has a chance to review the reactions and further restudy the special concerns.  Thank you.	Transcripts

Categorized Comment	337	Raymon, Suzen	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Why are we considering expanding pavement when the price of gas is so high and going higher? The only solution is something other than adding lanes.</p> <p>If adding lanes becomes a reality what is the plan for addressing the economic impact to small businesses?</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	481	Reed, Virginia	Public	5/1/2005	<p>Cecilia Joy Project Manager CDOT Region 1 18500 East Colfax Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy,</p> <p>I do not like any of the CDOT proposals for expansion of I-70. They all would bring noise, pollution, and more traffic to the areas through which I-70 passes.</p> <p>My suggestion is for an alternate route into the mountains, as Joanne Dittmer outlined in her column in the Denver Post. Turkey Creek Canyon (Highway 285), and several other routes have been proposed. These seem to me much less damaging to the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Please consider these alternate routes, which I think would also be less expensive.</p> <p>Sincerely yours,</p> <p>Virginia B. Reed</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	67	Regester, Gary	Public	1/12/2005	<p>From Gary Regester, presently Town Board member, Town of Silver Plume, 25 years. And member Clear Creek County Planning Commission, one year. Former mayor of Town of Silver Plume, 1982-1984.</p> <p>1. a) cost listings of elevated transit are from C-470 to Vail. Others alternatives are from C-470 to Frisco. So \$6.3 billion costing of elevated transit is unequally inflated.</p> <p>b) cost listings of other alternatives (6-8 laning) do not seem to factor in costs of the 15 years of disruption to interstate commerce and Colorado tourism.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>c) if elevated transit could be built first, along such alternate alignments which prevents major disruption of present I-70 use, elevated transit would be the cheapest alternative.</p> <p>2. PEIS mentions some mitigation plans. As example, Idaho Springs is offered a stacked highway. Silver Plume, which is a narrower valley than Idaho Springs, is offered nothing.</p> <p>More to the point, the Tier 1 process lacks a clear mitigation policy which, rather than tell a community "this is what you get," would ask the community, "what would you like." There should be mitigation policies in the Tier 1, not mitigation offerings.</p> <p>3. Geologic hazard on Georgetown-Silver Plume Hill cannot be mitigated. We have 1 death average each of the last five years, most recently a Silver Plume resident. Simply to increase the width and capacity of the freeway (by cantilever) will only increase the risk to a greater number of drivers. This is not mitigation, quite the opposite!</p> <p>A better idea is to tunnel either conventional underground tube to create a "tunnel" artificially on the present footprint by stacking the east and west lane and covering overhead with a shield/shelter.</p> <p>Your decisions regarding geologic hazard today affects the drivers of the next generation (2025+). When my grandchildren are struck down by rocks due to your poor decision of today, to whom do my survivors come to for recourse? Who here today will accept culpability in 2025?</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	113	Reid, Aaron	Public	1/19/2005	<p>Hi, my name is Aaron Reid, I live in Fruita, Colorado.</p> <p>For those asleep in the meeting, it's probably prudent that you're not in the hammer lane on the interstate. I'm looking at this -- and that's a serious statement, I'm not trying to be facetious or funny. It's a real danger.</p> <p>I know we had the law just passed with the driving in the left lane, upholding traffic for no apparent reason, regardless of conditions. I mean if it's snowy, fine.</p> <p>But we also had some other laws passed. With the insurance, now it's a \$1,000 fine if you're caught without. And, also, the BAC, the blood alcohol level. I'm glad to see those things progressing.</p> <p>Building a 20-lane wide interstate is not going to get rid of the people driving too slow in the left lane. However, if we, down at the license bureau, make this a more prudent test, where people are taking the test and they realize common sense matters, they can figure some things out.</p> <p>A lot of people have lost their respect for the truckers on the interstate and so on, and ten full-size pickups pay as much taxes as an 18-wheeler, and there's more of those on the road. So a lot of people realize that the interstates are here because of the trucking industry.</p> <p>So -- I'm not a trucker, but I realize what a fix we would be in without the trucks, and it's a good thing that the interstate came through in the '70s so we can have the supplies that we do on this side of the state.</p> <p>So I would just like to see this with a lot of foresight, this plan. I'm not for it or against it, I just came here tonight because I heard about it on the TV, and it would be neat to see something put together that's going to last 20, 30, 50 years down the road so we aren't spinning our wheels with our tax monies.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	586	Reid, David	Public	5/24/2005	<p>My general comments relative to the I70PEIS process and ultimate "solution" for the I-70 corridor are as follows:</p> <p>1. I very much concur with the recent conclusion that CDOT should immediately address what are currently being referred to as the "pinch points". The most serious "pinch point" in Clear Creek County is between the base of Floyd Hill and the East end of Idaho Springs through the Twin Tunnels. Virtually every day, and some times twice a day, this section of I-70 becomes a traffic jam. As I understand it, correcting this "pinch point" is a part of all seven or eight of the "preferred alternatives". Providing an appropriate detour in this location will absolutely have to be accomplished, before any of the alternatives can be implemented. Additionally, correcting this "pinch point" will provide some relief for all of the communities along I-70, the tourism industry, and for the tourists themselves, many of whom have currently quit making this trip to the Western Slope, because of these traffic jams.</p> <p>2. It is quite evident that the economic salvation for both the Western Slope the Eastern Slope communities along the I-70 corridor is tourism. For those Communities along the Eastern Slope in Clear Creek County, that form of tourism is "Western American Heritage and Mining History". This tourism is most prominently enjoyed by International Tourist. Since the "culture" of Europe and Asia is mass transit, the "Mass Transit" alternatives for solving the I-70 corridor "problem" should be seriously considered as preferable.</p> <p>Thank You for the opportunity to make these comments. I recognize all of the hard work that has been put into this project, and very much hope that you will be able to come up with a solution that will be the best for the most people. I don't envy you this task.</p> <p>Thanks again</p> <p>Dave Reid</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	299	Reiner, Don	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Hi. My name is Don Reiner. I live in Idaho Springs. I'm a member of the planning commission in town, and I have just a few comments.</p> <p>This is really nice. It's nice food, nice boards, nice documents -- big document, and I guess it's kind of accurate -- if big and accurate are synonymous, I don't know. Anyway, the only thing I see is: Where's the vision here? Can we not see what's happening? All we have to do is look east and west to see the folly of this expanding role all the time.</p> <p>California has highways that are ten lanes wide, and they're stopped, gridlock. People are just parked. And if you look to the east, we have New York, where I come from. We have the Long Island Expressway, which was started in '63, before I could drive, and it's not done yet. And whenever I go back there, they're widening it, they're making it bigger, and they're redoing the bridges, and it's still a bottleneck. It takes an hour and a half to go 40 miles from Manhattan to, say, Riverhead. We have -- or they have Golden State Parkway, [INAUDIBLE] State Parkway, Sunrise Highway, all the same thing, you</p>	Transcripts

					know, just stopped.	
					<p>We have the chance to set an example for the whole state, possibly the whole country. We have the technology, we have the space to do it, the middle of the highway, and we even have tunnels. It's my understanding that you could run a monorail through the air shaft of the Eisenhower Tunnel and not have to re bore it. The train will actually help blow the air through it.</p> <p>All we need is the vision to see it. The Summit County News said that the ski areas are in favor of more lanes, with the exception of Vail, I think. I'm not sure. But all I can say is from working up there in Keystone and seeing how the ski areas think, it's greed. They want more money quickly, and there is no concern for the safety or the convenience for their clients. All they want is to make their bottom line figure in a hurry.</p> <p>I don't know. I think CDOT should be assigned to maintenance, line painting, fixing bridges, picking up silt, dirt, salt, whatever, and we should have a new department called the CDOV, The Colorado Department of Vision, because I think that CDOT is blind to this. And that's all I have to say.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
Categorized Comment	778	Ressegui, George	Public	5/18/2005	<p>Minimal action is all that's needed right now, given the extreme differences of opinion on a longer-term strategy. The long-term strategies offered to date are incomplete and inadequate. No one is denying the I-70 highway needs some attention, but there is absolutely no need to expand to 6 lanes. George Ressegui 1770 Red Hawk Rd. Silverthorne, CO 80498 gressegui@comcast.net</p> <p>(Comment added at end of Our Future Summit Survey)</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	36	Rice, Dennis & Deb	Public	1/11/2005	<p>I-70 Corridor Expansion</p> <p>We currently live in Idaho Springs. Our house is located approximately 30 feet from the I-70 Corridor. We are not long time residents of this mountain town, however, we have spent a lifetime in the state of Colorado. We are not unique, being Colorado natives, in that we have always wanted and dreamed of living in the mountains. We finally made the move, almost 4 years ago, after saving and denying ourselves of extravagant living to purchase a Victorian Home that was built in 1900. This HOME is approximately 30 feet from I-70, as stated already. We can not help but think that expanding the highway to accommodate the ONCE a week traffic will not destroy a dream of a life time.</p> <p>We have observed the congestion—not deniable—for almost 4 years, as we work in Black Hawk and commute on I-70. Along with driving and observing our surroundings, we KNOW that the "TWIN TUNNELS" East of Idaho Springs are THE major choke on the commute. We have taken the last Eastbound exit from town and made a right and then a left onto what used to be State Highway-40 and proceeded to the Hidden Valley Exit and then merged, with ease onto I-70. This occurs because the MAIN CLOG IS the Twin Tunnels.</p> <p>As I said previously, I am a native of this beautiful state. I remember as a child traveling to Idaho Springs with my family to swim in the pool that existed where the Tourist Center is now. I remember being told that my uncle was born here. I remember being told I am related to the "Hager" family, one of the long time residents of this mountain town. I want to see this town, community and home continue.</p> <p>I can not help but believe that a "TOT" project, "TEAR OUT THE TUNNELS" campaign/project is more logical and fiscally more responsible than any proposed plan to date. The Environmental Impact Report?. Does it include the PEOPLE and the impact upon their lives? The life they have dreamed of and finally obtained and cherish.</p> <p>Does one day of traffic congestion justify destroying the life and dreams of even ONE person? Please evaluate the IMPACT.</p> <p>Dennis &amp; Deb Rice drrice6@juno.com Dhrice@juno.com</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	580	Rice, John	Public	5/24/2005	<p>My name is John Rice and I own and operate Clear Creek Rafting Company. I have been in business since 1992 running Raft trips on Clear Creek and the Arkansas River.</p> <p>Clear Creek and its access points for Rafting &amp; Kayaking trips needs to remain open and accessible from May 1 through Labor Day every year. Clear Creek is the 6th busiest stream for Commercial Rafting in the state of Colorado. The economic impact to the county is over 5.2 million annually with over 20,000 user days.</p> <p>There are key access points that must be available during the season. They are: 1. Lawson 2. Dumont 3. Hwy 103 4. Idaho Springs 5. Kermit's. I would be glad to show you the specific sites.</p> <p>The Creek bed and banks need to remain at or similar to their current conditions and remain suitable to Rafting &amp; Kayaking trips.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>John Rice Clear Creek Rafting Co. PO Box 3178, 350 Whitewater Rd. Idaho Springs, CO 80452-3178 Phone 303-567-1000 800-353-9901 Fax 303-567-9142 john@clearcreekrafting.com</p> <p>Home of Exciting Whitewater Trips!</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	764	Richmond, Rebecca	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	216	Rigger, Caren	Public	2/23/2005	<p>1. Make I70 a toll road across the state with discounts for CO citizens and second homeowners; i.e., use this money to offset cost. Out of state - \$2.00 citizen or by monthly or quarterly ticket \$ 40.</p> <p>2. Build the Rapid Transit System - not on tracks * overhead monorail system</p> <p>3. Widen I-70 where possible and easily and quickly</p> <p>4. Bus Transit between Denver and Vail. Give SC and Eagle counties money for bus services at bus depots.</p> <p>5. Work with state to require auto inspection and enforcement of auto/truck insurance laws.</p> <p>6. Upgrade alternate road south of Breckenridge from south of Denver.</p> <p>7. Mitigation - sand and mag chloride would increase by 100% destroying more environment.</p> <p>8. 25 years is unacceptable; a 10-year plan is themax overall.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	706	Rigger, Carla	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion), Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>I think widening to 6 lanes should be the last resort. Carla Rigger 1173 Straight Creek Drive G205 Dillon, CO 80435</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	37	Robberson, William	Public	1/11/2005	<p>corridor</p> <p>Unless the people who will profit from this project pay, it should not occur. For the taxpayers or other persons just crossing the mountains to be forced to pay for something that benefits chiefly the wealthy ski resorts and pleasure seekers is a crime.</p>	Online

william robberson  
robberson@myway.com

Categorized Comment	683	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8	Federal Agencies	5/27/2005	<p>UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 8 999 18TH STREET- SUITE 300 DENVER, CO 80202-2466 Phone 800-227-8917 http://www.epa.gov/region08</p> <p>Ref: 8EPR-N</p> <p>Jeffrey R. Kullman Regional Transportation Director Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>David Nicol Division Administrator, Colorado Division Federal Highway Administration 12300 W. Dakota Ave, Suite 180 Lakewood, CO 80228</p>	Written
<p>Re: EPA Comments on the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement CEQ # 040554</p>						
<p>Dear Messrs. Kullman and Nicol:</p>						
<p>The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, has reviewed the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS) for the I-70 Mountain Corridor transportation project. Our comments are provided in accordance with our authorities pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4231, Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.</p>						
<p>This DPEIS analyzes proposed alternatives for the I-70 transportation corridor from the western fringe of the Denver Metropolitan area to Glenwood Springs, Colorado. This "Tier 1" analysis is intended to support a decision on which mode(s) of transportation will operate in this corridor, what the general alignments of such modes will be, the general nature of the infrastructure needed to accommodate the modes, and the environmental and community impacts of these modes. The following comments are intended to assist you in preparing the Final Programmatic EIS upon which the selection of an alternative mode will be based.</p>						
<p>The DPEIS contains an enormous amount of information. In some areas, such as the indirect impacts of growth, it is among the most extensive analyses this EPA Region has seen within the context of an EIS. I want to acknowledge the significant work you have performed in analyzing the impacts of this difficult decision. We appreciate the strong working relationship EPA has with both the Colorado Division of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT). The DPEIS reflects many of the comments EPA made during the scoping and EIS development process.</p>						
<p>Results of EPA's Review and General Comments</p>						
<p>- As indicated in the DPEIS, the decision as to whether the project should accommodate short or long-term transportation needs (for a 2025 or a 50-year vision) has not yet been made. Until this is clarified, it is difficult to identify the environmentally-preferred alternative. The document shows that in order to meet short-term demand, generally, the dual-mode bus in guideway alternative, with its improved energy efficiency (as compared to diesel bus in guideway), lower construction impacts and operational flexibility, appears to have the fewest environmental impacts. The document appears to show that the minimal action alternative may also be environmentally preferred, particularly if travel management options are enhanced and analyzed, but this alternative is not in the preferred group. A longer-term solution will have additional impacts, but otherwise may be appropriate, depending on the purpose of this project. However, based on the information provided, it is difficult to determine which of the longer-term alternatives may have the least significant environmental impacts considering all resources evaluated.</p>						
<p>- No matter which alternative is selected, EPA strongly supports the stated environmental stewardship goals in the DPEIS that this is an opportunity to significantly enhance the environmental conditions throughout the existing corridor. This can be accomplished through state of the art mitigation and environmental management.</p>						
<p>- We also recommend that the Final EIS include a more detailed plan for minimizing both congestion and environmental impacts during the extensive period of construction.</p>						
<p>Specific Comments on the DPEIS</p>						
<p>- Purpose and Need: The DPEIS indicates that a decision will be made on whether to plan for accommodating short or long-term transportation needs before the preferred alternative is identified in the Final PEIS. EPA believes that this clarification is essential to the purpose and need statement and in helping identify the environmentally-preferred alternative for NEPA as well as the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA) under section 404 of the Clean Water Act.</p>						
<p>- Travel Demand Forecasts: The document relies on a baseline projection for travel demand that includes an estimate of current suppression demand and projections of maximum growth along the corridor, which were obtained from the affected counties and the Forest Service. This travel demand estimate is used as the basis for determining the adequacy of each alternative. The goal is then to accommodate the traffic at the peak hour of the peak day of the peak season, which may be unnecessary and raises additional questions. First, the projected numbers may over-estimate growth, so that alternatives appear to become congested sooner than they might otherwise. For example, the minimal action alternative was excluded from the preferred group of alternatives because it does not go far enough in meeting projected travel demand; however, given an expansion of travel management options, the minimal action alternative may well achieve a more realistic travel demand projection. Second, it is not clear whether FHWA and CDOT analyzed the sustainability of the ecosystem, given projected growth in the project area. An increase in population along with the projected increase in day and non-work visitors to the area could cause significant additional stress on the ecosystem, including the National Forests and the environmental infrastructure within local communities. It is not clear whether the impacts of this growth were contemplated in the White River National Forest and Arapahoe Roosevelt National Forest comprehensive management plans. The FEIS should discuss this issue.</p>						
<p>- Minimal Action Alternative: The DPEIS states that the minimal action alternative does not relieve congestion and would not meet the underlying need for the project (Page 2-22). As suggested above, the travel demand portion of the Minimal Action Alternative should be analyzed in greater detail, given the minimal environmental impacts of this alternative. This alternative is said to cost \$1.31 billion, with the bulk of that cost for construction. The cost allotted to travel demand management is \$104 million, and the DPEIS does not present any modeling to show how travel demand management might reduce demand. A significant component of the travel demand is recreational non-work days and overnight winter and summer weekends. Therefore, incentives to manage this demand may reduce congestion and increase capacity. We can discuss incentives for additional travel management should you desire. If possible, the FEIS should quantify the effects of a more robust travel demand management scenario on reducing existing and future peak demand, in both the short term and the long term.</p>						
<p>- Road Deicers: Road deicers can be a major contributor to water quality degradation. We are concerned that all alternatives appear to result in additional deicer usage, and that the impacts of deicers are not sufficiently analyzed. Although the document provides excellent information on the amount of deicer expected in various segments of the corridor, it does not include information on the impacts of additional deicer material on vegetation and water quality, nor does it include information on Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that water quality will not be further impaired by deicers. Deicer issues include compliance with chloride standards, ammonia, and metals. In addition, the current model used (FHWA's Driscoll model) is a one-time picture of water quality impacts from chemical deicers, and does not capture what will happen over time.</p>						
<p>- Sediment: The long-term fate and transport of sediment should be further addressed in the Tier 2 evaluations. Current usage of traction sand is listed as 76,050 tons per year along the entire project corridor, and is anticipated to increase for all of the alternatives. This is of particular concern along Straight Creek and Black Gore Creek, where both water bodies are on the State's impaired water list due to sediments. The DPEIS does not provide assurance that the water bodies will not be further impaired. The FEIS should include assurance that water bodies will not be further impaired in lieu of the specific BMPs, which we assume will be in the Tier 2 documents.</p>						
<p>- Storm water Permit: As stated above, the DPEIS does not provide certainty that impaired waters along the project corridor will not be further impaired, and that definite BMPs and/or mitigation measures will be included. Given the size and complexity of the project and the proximity of construction to several impaired water bodies, such an assurance cannot be given at this stage, and there is a strong concern that Colorado's general construction storm water permit will not be appropriate for the construction activities proposed along the corridor. We can provide specific suggestions on what should be included in an individual permit for these projects, if that would be of use to you for consideration in the final EIS.</p>						
<p>- Air Quality Impacts: The document does not adequately address Mobile Source Air Toxics. It also does not analyze PM 2.5 to show compliance with the NAAQS as well as a comparison of alternatives. In addition, there appears to be no PM10 monitoring near the right-of-way (e.g., within several hundred</p>						

feet) at a high volume, high congestion area. We recommend that this analysis be done and that monitoring for PM10 and/or PM 2.5 be done both during and after construction to adequately characterize air quality impacts.

- Indirect and Cumulative Impacts of Growth: The document does a good job of addressing the indirect and cumulative environmental impacts from growth, which are significant for this project. Habitat fragmentation and additional impervious surfaces which would lead to wildlife and water quality potential impacts are analyzed in this document. We appreciate the comprehensive analysis done in the DPEIS on this issue and acknowledge that CDOT and FHWA were responding in part to EPA's requests for such analysis. However, strategies on how to deal with these impacts are missing from the document. We can discuss strategies to address these growth impacts on a programmatic level and for more specific Tier 2 analyses.

- Environmental Justice: The document does not appear to support the conclusion that low income and minority populations are not disproportionately impacted by this project. EPA Region 8's methods of identifying low income and minority communities would have included more communities than the method used in the DPEIS. It is important for projects such as this to achieve meaningful public involvement for all minority and low income communities. We can provide additional suggestions on strategies to address these issues.

- Amount of Funding: The amount of funding committed by the Transportation Commission and available for this corridor over the next 20 years appears to be about \$1.6 billion (see pages ES-2 and 5-11), but the cut-off for choosing preferred alternatives is set at \$4 billion. The underlying basis for the \$4 billion is not set out in sufficient detail in the draft. If this is a significant basis for choosing preferred alternatives, there should be better information on the selection of \$4 billion as the cut-off.

#### Ratings

Based on the EPA's procedures for evaluating potential environmental impacts of proposed actions and the adequacy of information presented, EPA is rating all of the alternatives (both preferred and not preferred alternatives) as EC-2.

At this level of analysis, it is difficult to identify one environmentally preferred alternative when there are so many trade-offs of impacts among alternatives, and where the purpose and need statement does not focus on a short or longer-term solution. We cannot make the determination of an environmentally preferred alternative on the basis of the information presented. However, as stated above, the document appears to show that, for a short-term solution, the dual-mode bus in guideway alternative, and perhaps the minimal action alternative, appear to have the fewest overall environmental impacts. A longer-term solution will have additional impacts, but may be appropriate. We strongly recommend that any alternative selected should be designed and constructed using state of the art mitigation to improve environmental conditions and prevent further degradation along the corridor.

The "EC" (environmental concerns) portion of the rating means that EPA's review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. The "2" portion of this rating means that the draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. We recognize the difficulty in providing certain details at this stage of analysis, but some additional information would complete the full disclosure of information and better support your decisions. A summary of EPA's rating system is enclosed.

While we have summarized our key concerns in this letter, we offer to provide you with more detailed comments within the next 30 days. We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss these comments with you and provide the additional detail. If you have any questions on these comments, please contact me or Larry Svoboda at 303 312-6004. We look forward to a continuation of the excellent working relationship we believe we have developed with you on this very important project.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Roberts  
Regional Administrator

Enclosure

cc: Tom Norton, Executive Director, CDOT  
Chris Paulsen, CDOT Region 1  
Monica Pavlik, FHWA Colorado Division  
Jean Wallace, FHWA Colorado Division  
Tim Carey, US Corps of Engineers

Categorized Comment	772	Robertson, Susan	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion), Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  I feel that we are entirely too dependant on cars and fossil fuels. Although there is more expense involved initially in developing a fixed guideway, it is irresponsible of us to not consider alternatives such as this.	Written
Categorized Comment	425	Rockne, Carol	Public	3/10/2005	I feel you should go ahead as soon as possible with construction of 6 lanes with room for a future rail if possible but only if possible. 6 lanes make sense and will do the job for the next 60 years.  Thank you Carol Rockne Breckenridge, CO 80424	Email
Categorized Comment	246	Rogers, James	Public	3/2/2005	While rail does not presently seem to be the preferred option for this corridor, I do wish that it was the preferred choice. Please reconsider your choice. Widening the I-70 corridor with concrete will not provide the benefits that rail will. We can be a State stuck with 19th century solutions, or we can move into the 21st century with a viable rail solution.	Online
Categorized Comment	272	Roman, Greg	Public	2/26/2005	Hi, I am a resident of Grand County. I believe this concern for the I-70 Mountain Corridor is a seasonal event (winter - summer) and primarily weekend and holidays in our current situation. But we need to have foresight here, our vision needs to be beyond 2025. We need to fully utilize the I-70 right of way. I believe the Combination/Preservation plan is the way to go. The Six Lane Highway and Elevated AGS. We need to explore other options than just the I-70 corridor. A southern highway-tunnel system into the mountains possibly the 285 corridor. A northern highway tunnel system needs to be explored as another option.	Form
Categorized Comment	613	Climax Molybdenum Company	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	COLORADO OPERATIONS Henderson Mine P. O. Box 68 Empire, CO 80438 Phone (303) 569-3221 Fax (303) 569-2830  May 24, 2005  Via Electronic and Parcel Post  Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Chris Paulsen, Deputy Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011  Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228  RE: Draft PEIS, I-70 Mountain Corridor.  Dear Ms Joy, Mr. Paulsen and Ms Wallace:  The following comments from Climax Molybdenum Company (Climax) respond to the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation (PEIS) published December 2004 by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and the Colorado Department of Transportation.	Online

The Climax Molybdenum Company owns and operates the Henderson Mine, located in Clear Creek County near Berthoud Pass, the Henderson Mill, located in the Williams Fork Drainage in Grand County and the Climax Mine along Highway 91 in Lake, Summit and Eagle Counties. These substantial operations reside in counties affected by the proposed project. Climax employs more than 500 people in multiple communities along the I-70 Mountain Corridor and contributes significantly to the economy of the region. Numerous employees commute I-70, many from Front Range communities. The impact of this project on employee willingness to commute through the construction during the period suggested in the PEIS to work at Climax facilities is expected to be significant.

Climax has a long history of promoting activities that contribute to the economic viability of the communities in which it operates. Consistent with this philosophy, Climax supports efforts to improve the I-70 corridor and recognizes the need for such improvements. However, Climax wishes to express its opinion that such a project must be done prudently to ensure that the broad range of potentially affected interests are considered and adequately protected. Most notable, the Climax Molybdenum Company believes that the PEIS inadequately addresses water quality considerations and selection of preferred alternatives based on prevailing technological capabilities of highway development.

Climax is associated with committees whose primary focus is directed at regional water quality issues to include non-point source water quality improvement activities, standards setting, and TMDL development. As a major discharger to Woods Creek, a tributary to the West Fork of Clear Creek, and Tenmile Creek, a tributary to Dillon Reservoir, Climax has witnessed substantial improvements to water quality in the region through cooperative and strategic stakeholder involvement on numerous initiatives. While Climax recognizes that the PEIS will be followed by supplemental impact evaluations, it appears that concerted efforts to improve water quality may be degraded to the degree that non-point source water quality impacts could affect permitted dischargers in the region. It is imperative that water quality impacts be fully understood on a regional level and that appropriate mitigation be made a component of the project.

The PEIS provides impressive detail on corridor alternatives in the selection of preferred alternatives. However, Climax believes it is critical that the focus of such planning be broad in scope to include sufficient detail on all viable alternatives. It is the opinion of the Climax Molybdenum Company that additional study is required prior to eliminating all potential transit alternatives. Consistent with this concern, Climax is suspect that the alternative selection appropriately weighs cost against present and future economic, environmental, and safety considerations. The PEIS did not appear to apply the same level of critical study to several transit approaches as it did to the highway-widening option.

This project poses numerous important issues to us as well as our neighboring communities. Climax appreciates your consideration of these comments as well as those made by other parties who share similar concerns. We understand that extensive evaluation and comment are being provided by locally affected citizens, counties and communities and it is our expectation that these comments be given careful review. Climax anticipates further participation in the process and intends to analyze and comment on upcoming Supplemental Environmental Impact Statements.

Please contact me at (303) 569-3221, ext. 1204 if you have any questions or require clarification.

Sincerely,

Bryce Romig

Bryce Romig  
Environmental Manager  
Climax Molybdenum Company

Categorized Comment	464	Rowe, George	Public	4/8/2005	From: rowege@juno.com To: www.i70mtcorridor.com Cc: www.jean.walace@fhwa.dot.gov Subject: I-70 Draft PEIS  Thanks,  For the chance to give input, I feel we should look for other feasible corridors to split the traffic. Concentrating the west and east bound traffic on 170 is causing stress for adjacent property owners and on the traveling public and is strategically a bad idea. Interstate highways were predicated and planned as defensive routes during the "like" administration. Thanks again for the opportunity.  George Rowe (303-5261118)	Email
Categorized Comment	61	Rutter, Julie	Public	1/12/2005	With the state of future traffic and congestion problems, fm all for a monorail system through the I-70 Corridor!  1. It makes perfect sense for the 15 ski areas' traffic. It would also encourage more Destination Resorts for out of towners and bring in vacation people that enjoy the comfort of not driving or relying on buses, vans, limos, etc., less stress and enjoy the beautiful scenery!  2. Let's upgrade our beautiful I-70 Corridor by using monorails and not mutilating our gorgeous mountains any more than we have too!  3. European monorails have helped with their extreme traffic problems for years. Isn't it about time we modernized our I-70 for much better travel through our Rocky Mountains?	Form
Categorized Comment	95	S, S	Public	1/31/2005	I would like to have a www.coloradomonorail.com presentation held at the public meetings. Is this a possibility? Please call 303.567.488 to get the presenter May to the presentations...how can we not look more closely at this option? Scott	Online
Categorized Comment	188	S, S	Public	2/15/2005	The Colorado Monorail Truth... www.coloradomonorail.com is a step in the right direction. We all must feel we are impacting society with a new technology. The possibilities for this technology are immense. The speed with which science will improve based upon our monorail destiny will stagger the mind. It is an order of magnitude jump in science and technology and transportation. Imagine turning 100,000 into a million...That is a jump in order of magnitude. Our levels will increase hugely. Our transportation success with the I 70 monorail is only one of the successes we will gain from the project. The benefits are almost too many to list!	Online
Categorized Comment	189	S, S	Public	2/15/2005	The elevated monorail through the I 70 Corridor is as important as the Space Shuttle and Nasa's pursuits. So we are all on the same page...	Online
Categorized Comment	190	S, S	Public	2/15/2005	The Linear Induction Motor represents a huge step in the rail transport problem - which when completed satisfactorily has many implications. What if we want to shoot an object at the speed of electricity? Rail Gun. Can we use the LIM to transport things into space? You tell me. Is the rail launch system any better than previous launch systems? The Navy will utilize the technology to rebuild our steam catapults. The launch system at Nasa is antiquated and obsolete. Need I say more? Is anyone questioning the importance of the rail gun? The monorail is a matter of scale and timing. Who wants the highest speed safest transport? Scott	Online
Categorized Comment	245	S, S	Public	3/1/2005	It has come to my attention that we are wondering why we should build such a monorail when it will only benefit a small percentage of Colorado's population. For starters this is a myth. The monorail will not only benefit riders and towns but also anyone that uses science and engineering to do their daily tasks. Our scientific levels will raise huge levels with the construction of an environmentally friendly transportation and launch system. Ask ourselves is Nasa benefitting mankind? Well the train is a step ahead of Nasa.	Online
Categorized Comment	526	Sailor, Matt	Public	5/20/2005	In the Executive Summary/p 34 the report states that the I-70 corridor "offers views of historic mountain towns and occasional glimpses of wildlife." Most residents of Clear Creek County find this erroneous. The viewing of wildlife is a constant fact of daily life. Floyd Hill is a frequent habitat of elk and many times a danger to traffic due to their frequent crossing of the highway. Big Horn Sheep are often seen grazing the grass next to the Highway close to the twin tunnels. From there they migrate to Empire and Georgetown where the Division of Wildlife has a viewing station on the east side of the highway. Deer roam the entire corridor, as well as fox, mountain lion and an "occasional" wolf. Wildlife crossings are a necessity in this area and should not be an afterthought. We would like acknowledgement that the area over the top of the twin tunnels provides an important and frequently used passage for deer and other wildlife. Game trails are visible from the frontage road.	Online

The report states that the corridor " offers views of historic mountain towns" however the necessity of sound barriers to mitigate the noise will destroy these views.

The study neglects to acknowledge the existence of the James Peak Wilderness area as well as the Mountain Evans Wilderness Area. Of the many Wilderness Areas addressed in the study, James Peak is the closest in proximity to I-70. The study suggests that the visual impact to these areas will be negligible due to less pollution when traffic moves smoothly as opposed to stop and go. The suggestion that more traffic will result in less pollution is dubious and this study fails to take into account the stop and go traffic with 15 years of construction.

In the Cumulative Impact Analysis, p 4-31, the study states that "Planned future development will consume 32% of the Corridor View shed Area. Pressures for additional increased development from alternatives might alter the highly valued Corridor character from a rural mountain character to an urban character." This drastic change to the visual experience of the traveler and the residents was not taken into consideration when analyzing the visual impact of the preferred alternatives.

The study indicates that with the improved flow of traffic there will be less pollution in spite of 150% increase in traffic. There is no mention made of the 15 years of construction with stop and go traffic. There are numerous studies that show increased health risks to those living and working within 250 yards of heavy traffic areas. Idaho springs has 2 schools, a Recreational Center and a Senior Center within 100 yards of the highway. Carlson Elementary School has been at this location for over 100 years. Any detours during construction will take traffic on Colorado Blvd and within 10-15 yards of classrooms and the playground. Five historic churches are also located on Colorado Blvd which is the only alternate route through town. A study of the health impacts of the preferred alternatives should be included in this PEIS.

In spite of the fact that the PEIS attempts to discuss affordable housing, I see no assurances that those small affordable homes in eastern and central Idaho Springs and Silver Plume that are extremely close to the existing I-70 will not be adversely affected if not eliminated. (the study mentions homes in western I. S. not being impacted) Some of these homes are occupied by elderly residents or low income workers who can not afford to purchase a home in another area. There is limited room in the valley to build alternative affordable housing. Clear Creek County has one lumber yard, one pharmacy and one supermarket. All are within approximately 25 yards of the existing I-70. Not only is the County and the town dependent on the revenues from these businesses, but the same is true of the residents. Elderly and low income populations often have limited ability to travel outside of the County for these services. 3.11.62 states that the exact extent of the direct impacts to low income and non-low income populations cannot be determined at the Tier I level. They do go on to state that the social effects, such as noise and diminution of aesthetic values would be the same for low income as for non-low income populations. How was this measured? It seems only reasonable to assume that those living next to the highway will be more heavily impacted than those living on the mountain side. This Environmental Justice information is invalid. Is this an attempt to sacrifice the affordable housing and shopping in Clear Creek for the convenience of 2nd home owners further to the west?

Since the majority of the construction will be in Clear Creek County and is estimated to take 15 years to complete, it is also reasonable to assume that the economic impact will be devastating. In spite of this, the PEIS does not make any attempt to evaluate the impact as a stand alone county. Recreational impacts are mentioned in the report, but the impact on Loveland Basin and the Rafting Industry may be enormous. The revenues from these activities contribute considerably to our County's economy. The study looks at the impact of nine counties averaged together, even though some of the counties are not in the I-70 corridor. This invalidates this part of the study.

Categorized Comment	76	Saindon, Kenneth	Public	1/21/2005	<p>Interest in Mountain Corridor Solutions</p> <p>Online</p> <p>Sirs:</p> <p>I am a long-time Colorado resident, an avid skier and a licensed engineer. I have seen weekend traffic flow on the I-70 corridor deteriorate to alarmingly ineffective levels over the past decade, seriously damaging one of the state's major economic powers (tourism). As a motorist, my initial observations indicate that apart from a grossly underdesigned infrastructure, traffic problems are strongly tied to three issues.</p> <p>The first is trucks. A good example is the truck in the left lane on the Silver Plume grade doing 23 mph to pass the other truck going 20 mph. Not an exaggeration and not uncommon. The results are often seen a considerable distance to the east. The solution: vigorous enforcement by the Highway Patrol. The road hog law should be enforced and restrictions should be employed to preclude trucks of a certain size/class from operating this constricted corridor during the peak flow periods (weekends). Tire chain and similar violations that result in thousands of person-hours of delay should be attached to a fine that corresponds with the loss and inconvenience of those thousands of people. Otherwise, the names of the offenders should be made public so that those who suffer significant financial loss may bring civil action against the offenders.</p> <p>In this case, simply publicizing this policy would likely result in significant improvement.</p> <p>Why should a large percentage of the state's visitors and population in general, and a major Colorado industry suffer for the convenience of the relatively small number of truckers who callously chose to work weekends and ignore common sense rules?</p> <p>The second issue is the tunnel. I have been stopped at the tunnel several times (while Loveland Pass was open) for no apparent reason. When the pass is closed, why not have the hazmat trucks wait until rush hour has passed? I understand that these trucks are prohibited from operation in metro areas during rush hour - what's the difference?</p> <p>Finally, driver education. The left lane passing law should help, but it should be publicized and enforced.</p> <p>I have several other several thoughts on methods that can be used to address the problem on an interim basis. Unfortunately, I travel frequently for a living and find it impossible to attend your public meetings. Please let me know how best to contribute in this important debate.</p> <p>brendan.shine bshine@geotransinc.com</p>
Categorized Comment	125	Sajbel, Sandra	Public	1/12/2005	<p>It's Sandra Sajbel. I live on Floyd Hill. Thank you for all the hard work that went into this impressive document. I noticed one of your nonpreferred alternatives, the AGS -- the thing that really excited me and people I have spoken with are the smaller footprints of all the alternatives, the fact that from a noise, air quality, and wildlife perspective it seems to have the least impact, or at least some of the most benign impacts.</p> <p>The concern in the corridor counties, of which I'm a member, is that the highway alternatives will have a drastic impact on traffic flow that, quite frankly, not too many people want to wait out the 15 years. This appears to be the least wanted of the alternatives from our perspective, or my perspective, I should say, and people I've spoken with.</p> <p>Of the preferred highway alternatives, we found it to be a little concrete-dependent, a little asphalt-heavy, and in comparison of some of your charts there, it also seems to be the highest for emission and noise levels. I would like to urge you to consider at this level, or at this point in time, the traffic in the mountain corridor destinations; could they handle all the traffic of a six-lane highway going up to their door? I'm not sure that that's been fully evaluated -- I apologize. I'm being corrected there. But I don't think anyone living in the corridor counties wants to see T-Rex moved up to here where there are no alternative routes to escape it.</p> <p>Specifically on behalf of my family and my neighbors. I wanted to mention that the 55-mile-per-hour alternative, which includes perhaps traveling through south back mountain scares us. We really worry about the aquifer. We want to urge you to consider at this point the cost of water and sewage replacement for those of us who have water and want to keep it.</p> <p>And the main concern that I feel, and I would urge everyone in the Front Range communities and in Denver to really consider -- across Colorado, actually -- is with our highways getting wider and wider, we have to ask ourselves, Are we going to destroy the Colorado that everybody comes here to enjoy and admire? Thank you.</p>
Categorized Comment	717	Samuels, Donald	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>No action (but continue \$532 million in already planned improvements)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response.</p>
Categorized Comment	496	Village at Genesee Owners Association	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/10/2005	<p>See attached letter on behalf of the Village at Genesee Owners Association.</p> <p>Village at Genesee Owners Association</p> <p>May 10, 2005</p>



TO: Colorado Dept. of Transportation

Re: Comments on the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS

Our Association represents 68 single-family homes within the Village at Genesee. Our homes are on Genesee Village Road, Sunrose Lane, and Pondview Place and we are the closest to I-70 of all of the homes in Genesee. When our homes were built nearly twenty years ago, the noise and pollution from I-70 was barely noticeable and not any problem at all. Now, the highway noise and fumes are a definite problem which adversely affects everyone in our community. Highway noise and pollution are also the most cited reasons given by potential buyers of property here as to why they do not want to buy property here.

Our concerns, therefore, are that any plans to accommodate significant additional traffic volume on I-70 do as much as is reasonably feasible to minimize and/or mitigate the amount of additional noise and pollution that will impact our community. This could be done by (1) selecting alternatives such as the monorail or the fixed guideway system which would minimize vehicles, noise, and pollution; (2) using quiet and otherwise environmentally friendly buses for some of the traffic; (3) diverting traffic to other routes; (4) building high earthen berms (NOT concrete barriers) and planting appropriate vegetation along the sides of the roadway; or (5) some combination of these alternatives.

I-70 is already a significant and troublesome source of noise and pollution through our beautiful mountains. We simply cannot afford to let these problems get much worse. Otherwise, we destroy our reasons for living here. Thus, these are problems that must be adequately addressed in any plan to accommodate yet more traffic in our mountains.

Sincerely,

John F. Sass  
Board Presidentc/o Tyler Community Management, Inc.  
830 Kipling St. #120, Lakewood, CO 80215  
(303) 232-9200 Fax (303) 232-3240 E-mail: barbara@tylergmt.com

Categorized Comment	690	Satter, Etta	Public	5/24/2005	Phone message May 24, 8:32 am. " Hi Cecelia, my name is Etta Satter, I just went on the website to comment on the draft PEIS for I-70 and it said that my email address was invalid, well it's not invalid and but none the less I wasn't able to leave my comment. So let me just let you know that I am extremely disappointed that the options that you're putting forth...a... none of them really have a sensible alternative that will take care of the issue long term and I consider that alternative to be the fixed guideway system... some kind of real mass transit. Being a Clear Creek County resident we have stop and go traffic now. 15, 10 to 15 years of construction stop and go is not going to solve our problem and you're going to destroy Clear Creek County. There are mine tailings, there are, there are environmental issues, there are wildlife issues, there's so many issues that you're not considering and I just think this is inadequate... a snow removal (for you?), your high occupancy... people can't get off in our towns... um, it's just, it's just not going to work, not going to work. So please take my comment and it sure is unfortunate that your website will not allow valid email um there's probably lots of people who would like to make that comment and that are having the same problem. Thank you."	Phone Record
Categorized Comment	714	Say, Cynthia	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  If we build more lanes we end up with more lanes of traffic! Has anyone BEEN to California??? Its time to move away from single passenger vehicles and move into the 21st century. Cynthia Say, cynthiasay@netbeam.net, 83 swan Drive, Breckenridge, CO	Written
Categorized Comment	652	Denver Regional Council of Governments	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/19/2005	Denver Regional Council of Governments 4500 Cherry Creek Drive South, Suite 800 Denver, Colorado 80246-1531 Tel: 303-455-1000 Fax: 303-480-6790 Website: www.drcog.org  May 19, 2005  Ms. Cecelia Joy Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011  Dear Ms. Joy:  Re: Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS  The following provides Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) staff comments regarding the I-70 Mountain Corridor Tier 1 Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS).  In summary, we suggest that travel demand reduction and traffic operational measures need more attention, particularly in the short-term; that operations issues of the various alternatives be more fully considered; and that the considerable implementation issues be addressed before a preferred alternative is selected. We also remain concerned about the environmental effects and the impacts on residents and governmental units in the corridor. It is requested that the final PEIS respond to the questions listed below.  Travel Demand Reduction  We note that the demand for additional capacity along I-70 is largely a weekend phenomenon, driven primarily by recreational trips.  Transportation Demand Management strategies could be helpful in reducing this peaking both in the short term, since funding for major capacity improvements does not appear to be available, and in the long term as highway capacity is expected to be depleted by 2030 under any of the alternatives.  1. What measures have been considered to provide real-time information to better inform travelers of congested corridors and travel alternatives before travel on I-70 is initiated?  2. What provisions will be made for courtesy patrol and emergency response? How will these services be funded?  Social, Economic, Environmental Impacts  Major challenges of construction in this corridor are the mitigation of impacts on the natural environment and on current residents while providing accessibility to support the state's tourist industry.  1. Should further widening of the existing cross-section be necessary, does COOT plan to contextually design and build the transportation facility in an environmentally and visually sensitive manner (e.g., Glenwood Canyon)? It appears that the draft PEIS suggests a more conventional construction.  2. How will residents in the area be accommodated during the lengthy construction period?  3. What will be done to safeguard Clear Creek and other streams from water pollution and erosion during and after construction?  4. How will the economic impacts on local governments to support broader state and national goals be compensated?  Alternatives  A number of questions relate to the ability to operate the various alternatives selected.  1. It would appear that snow storage and removal could be problematic in barrier-separated facilities. How will snow removal be conducted in barrier-separated bus guideways? Where will the snow be stored?  2. Why was the continuous access bus lane rejected as an alternative? Are there technologies available to assist with policing these lanes?  3. What has been the maintenance history of guided bus and AGS technology? What experience is there of these technologies operating in ice and snow conditions? What experience is there of guided buses operating in steep terrain?  4. Outside of a desire to minimize right-of-way required, why was the standard diesel bus in a standard	Written

separated right-of-way discarded?

5. What technology would be used to safely reverse lanes? What is the projected annual cost of the proposed technology and where is it currently utilized?

6. The "trail" transportation modes will require a change in mode (e.g., from train to rental car or bus) for many of the trips. What has been assumed regarding the provision and funding of these support services? How realistic is this for summer patrons who will be transporting a significant amount of baggage and traveling to remote locations? Would the cost of this travel be competitive with driving the entire trip despite delays?

7. What contingencies has COOT considered to accommodate travel demand once the highway widening-only alternatives reach capacity?

#### Implementation

There appears to be considerable uncertainty about how the alternatives would be implemented and who would be responsible, especially for those that include transit modes.

1. It would appear that construction of any of the alternatives would take considerable time. Has CDOT developed a segment staging or prioritization process for implementation?

2. Could decision-making regarding actions to be taken be staged to allow more time to more fully consider all alternatives? Could, for example, efforts be focused first on the Minimal Action alternative, leaving time to more fully explore the best transit alternative for the corridor?

3. What agency will be responsible for implementing and operating transit service in the corridor? Who would provide the operating subsidy?

4. Who will be responsible for advocating and coordinating travel demand reduction measures?

Thank you for requesting comments on the draft PEIS. We look forward to your responses.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Schaufele  
Executive Director

c: Harry Dale, Clear Creek County Commission  
Mike Spies, Town of Empire  
Ernest Dunn, Town of Georgetown  
Bill Macy, City of Idaho Springs  
Fred Lyssy, Town of Silver Plume  
Jeff Kulman, CDOT Region 1 Director  
Jean Wallace, Federal Highway Administration

Categorized Comment	178	Schindler, Ray	Public	1/15/2005	I'm Ray Schindler. I used to work for the highway department, right-of-way.	Transcripts
					<p>And on one of your projects, in fact, here it shows you that the monorail is on this existing right-of-way -- that would be my proposal too -- not something that is in the center, and change the alternative or the roadbed, not like the HOV lanes that cost billions of dollars by the highway department and has not really been very effective with the number of cars that travel I-25. I saw that being a boondoggle. All the bridges that were built and torn down, all the ones on the T-Rex. It's a joke.</p> <p>I've seen all the mistakes that engineers with education have made -- the mistakes. I've seen and heard logical understanding from businesspeople here. I'm glad they've talked and given that side of the point. I'm going to give my side of the point from my view.</p> <p>Europe has used rail for many years to their ski slopes and everywhere else. The biggest economy this state has is the ski slopes; Vail and Beaver Creek and Copper Mountain, all those -- Loveland could benefit from a monorail. People who would take that monorail up to the slopes quicker don't have to wait behind traffic.</p> <p>I've driven and rode since the 1960s all the way up to Rifle and Aspen. I've been on the two-lane road over Loveland and Vail. I know what the danger was. When they improved it, it was terrific. I was working in Glenwood Springs when they widened it to Aspen. I heard the comments about how many people were going to move into that valley from Glenwood Springs to Aspen. They improved the road all the way to Aspen. They said they resisted -- Aspen people didn't want it, but they were going to come regardless, and they did it.</p> <p>And they did a good job when they built the I-70 corridor through Glenwood Canyon. That's one of the best engineered designs that they came up with.</p> <p>Even the highway department had a better engineering than the whole -- the hundreds of thousands of dollars they paid consultants. Thank you.</p> <p>Where I'm going to come from is I gave my ideas to other engineers when I worked for the highway department about using monorail, and of course, it was shrugged off. The cost of building something was an existing right-of-way, the cost of property, that's going to escalate, and even more so, widening anymore.</p> <p>The construction, people have already addressed that. The asphalt, everything else that's been said. And as the one lady said about Disney, he had an idea over 40 or 50 years ago, and nobody in this country is -- has used it for one good purpose, and that is to help create a better atmosphere for transportation.</p> <p>Colorado Highway Department, if you're going to change the transportation, do it.</p>	
Categorized Comment	533	Schmid, David	Public	5/21/2005	It is my feeling after reading the executive summary that we need to reassess our willingness to increase our budget. Providing more lanes of traffic will not change the thought processes of the users. We need to make long term decisions based on what is good for the environment and local needs more than bottom dollar. In this time of expensive gas and ever depleting natural resources more of the same will not work. If the cost of the AGS system is more expensive so be it, that is what we need to do.	Online
Categorized Comment	399	Schoenfeld, Jimmy	Public	3/23/2005	I think this monorail idea is amazing. I have always had a planned underground railway from Denver to the ski resorts in my mind, but I never thought it would happen. And this is it, only it is a monorail, which is faster and better! If I lived in Colorado full-time, I would be fighting for this issue as much as possible. Here in Ohio, the idea of a fast above-ground monorail from Denver International Airport to all of the ski resorts along I-70 is the solution to never having to rent a car again. And I won't have to pay the expensive fares to fly into Vail/Eagle because I could fly into Denver instead. I sure hope you can make this happen. I would hate to watch I-70 expand and ruin the environment, especially the beautiful Eagle River that flows along it. Make your plans a reality!	Online
Categorized Comment	296	Schroeder, Robert	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Bob Schroeder of Georgetown, although I'm not representing Georgetown in an official capacity. To begin with, I'd like to thank you for extending the comment period. I would hope that now that there is more time, rather than not asking for applause that you encourage applause if there's something that the audience agrees with. It gives you an opportunity to see what -- what this group agrees with or doesn't agree with.</p> <p>I have a number of concerns. But because of limited time, I'll comment only on Section 3.4 dealing with water resources. About ten years ago I was working in Dillon and had the occasion to inspect a small domestic water supply intake on Straight Creek. The fore bay was very small but needed the space for heavy sediment to settle and allow for a regulated flow to the intake. However, it was so full of sand that the water was only a few inches deep. Sediment was being sucked into the inlet, which meant it needed to be taken out at the treatment plant, thus reduce capacity and made treatment more costly.</p> <p>Not only was the intake full, but an abundance of sand could be seen in many places along Straight Creek. CDOT personnel were with us on the inspection. Their only answer was that there were facilities that handled the sediment that they had not serviced because there was no money in the budget.</p> <p>Assuming the Clear Creek County communities do survive the reconstruction of I-70, what guarantee is there that you're going to take care of what you build? Sure, we'll pick up the trash that people throw out along the way, but what about the stuff that can't be cared for by citizens who volunteer to adopt a highway?</p> <p>CDOT's track record on maintenance is not that great. In many areas, care of embankments, rockfall, where rockfall has occurred, is inadequate. There are structures on I-70 all the way from Utah to Kansas that are long overdue for a coat of paint. Look at the mess of landscaping along I-25 through Denver. What do you suppose visitors to the city are thinking? I wonder, with all the concrete and metal work on T-Rex projects, if you are really equipped budget-wise to take care of what you are building. What happens on the Clear Creek side when there's no money in this CDOT budget to take of sediment from I-70?</p> <p>The PEIS says there are 46 reservoirs involved in the Clear Creek diversions, but there is only one on-stream reservoir situated to accept sediment produced from the highway, and that's at Georgetown.</p>	Transcripts

The upper part of this reservoir is especially shallow, and a lot of this sediment has surely already displaced the water storage. In fact, the PEIS admits that Georgetown Lake catches a good deal of sediment along with reducing concentrations of sodium, magnesium, manganese, and chloride.

Just to recover one-acre foot of storage requires removal of 1,600 cubic yards of material. From the Georgetown exit west to the tunnel, 13,000 tons of sand and 264,000 gallons of deicer are used every year on the present highway. Where will the sediment from Georgetown Lake have to be hauled to, particularly if they contain high concentrations of materials that are considered pollutants?

I have found nothing in the PEIS where CDOT is committed to clean up the mess when the lake is full of sediment or when the chemical concentrations reach a point that water quality causes the lake to become a liability. Most, if not all, of the proposals involve increasing the impervious cover while increasing -- which increase the storm runoff and runoff rates.

Runoff from the 12 miles of I-70 flows through Georgetown. Stream channels through the town are already severely confined and not equipped to handle increases in runoff rates from storms. In many places, if Clear Creek reaches the top of the bank, it will overflow and inundate small businesses and historic homes.

I'm certain that one of the great alternatives will be built. I see very little in the way of benefit to Clear Creek County. The project is supposed to make things better. Well, they need to be better for us too, not just our friends in Summit and Eagle counties. Put something in the PEIS that will not only protect but improve Georgetown Lake and our watershed. Tell us how you will assure us that they are protected from flooding and severe runoff events.

Categorized Comment	284	Scott, Patricia	Public	2/9/2005	<p>I am a homeowner in Georgetown, Colorado. I attended the public hearing held at the Easter Seal Camp on February 9, and have read the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.</p> <p>My feeling is that any decision you make regarding the I-70 Mountaing Corridor as stated in your "preferred group of alternatives" would do permanent damage to the towns of Idaho Springs, Georgetown, and Silver Plume. Any alternative which includes the widening of I-70 to a six-lane highway would destroy this National Historic Landmark. The negative impact on the environment, public health, historic preservation, cultural assets, and the tourism which supports the economy would be devastating.</p> <p>Please recognize the plea of my neighbors and myself not to destroy our homes, our economy, and the future of those who will never know the beauty and history of our treasured towns.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	517	Scott, Robert	Public	5/19/2005	<p>FUTILITY OF I-70 EXPANSION</p> <p>The most serious problem that has not been adequately addressed is the strong likelihood that the peak of petroleum production will be reached just before or during the I-70 expansion project. If this happens, the enormous expense in dollars and time will be wasted. Also the drastic disruption of the I-70 corridor will be to no avail. This is because the reduction of availability and increase in cost of fuel will cause a drastic reduction of traffic on I-70, making the construction efforts unnecessary.</p> <p>Here are some relevant facts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consensus among most outstanding international petroleum geologists is that the peak of petroleum production will occur between 2005 and 2010.</li> <li>• Once the peak has been reached, demand will exceed production capability by several percent and will increase each year because the geologic limits prohibit more rapid production.</li> <li>• More and more of the oil fields we have been getting petroleum from are in decline and even the greatest field of all, the Ghawar field of Saudi Arabia is now most likely in decline.</li> <li>• Transportation is 90 percent dependent upon petroleum with no viable liquid substitute fuel in sight.</li> <li>• Robert Hirsch (with SAIC) and colleagues have made a thorough and conservative 2005 report on peak petroleum published by the U.S. Department of Energy's National Energy Technology Laboratory in which the authors provide three scenarios:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "If mitigation is not started until peak occurs, over a decade of oil shortages and economic hardship will ensue."</li> <li>2. "Initiation of mitigation 10 years before peaking still results in supply shortages, albeit not as severe."</li> <li>3. "Only initiation 20 years before peaking would avoid shortages."</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. The Hirsch report states that in their estimate, peak oil is most likely to occur 2016, only a tad more than 10 years from now. And we have no plans for a crash program to develop substitute liquid fuels.</li> <li>• You can read 2 short versions of the Hirsch report: one is 6 pages at <a href="http://www.misi-net.com/publications/ist_article.pdf">www.misi-net.com/publications/ist_article.pdf</a>, and one is 3 pages at <a href="http://www.misi-net.com/publications/energy_magazine.pdf">www.misi-net.com/publications/energy_magazine.pdf</a></li> <li>• You can read the full 91-page report, Peaking World Oil Production: impacts, Mitigation, and Risk Management, at <a href="http://www.misi-net.com/publications/oil_peaking.pdf">www.misi-net.com/publications/oil_peaking.pdf</a></li> </ul> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Robert Scott</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	554	Scott, Robert	Public	5/23/2005	<p>THE MINIMUM ALTERNATE SHOULD BE THE MAXIMUM!</p> <p>I endorse the alternate plan agreed upon by 31 governments along I-70 that is based on CDOT's minimum alternate. It makes sense to fix problem areas step-by-step with a reconsideration of Rapid Transit solution between each step for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fixing only trouble spots will greatly reduce the negative impacts on local communities along I-70.</li> <li>2. Fixing problem spots will make I-70 safer.</li> <li>3. As each trouble spot is fixed, congestion will be reduced in that area.</li> <li>4. Fixing one trouble spot at a time will spread out the cost making it easier to fund.</li> <li>5. Most knowledgeable international petroleum geologists predict that the world will reach the peak of oil production and the end of cheap petroleum by 2010. Expensive and/or less available fuel for vehicles will reduce traffic on I-70. Thus, it is likely that major construction on I-70, if it is more extensive than fixing trouble spots, will create huge unnecessary expenses and negative impacts on the local communities along I-70 for a highway that will be under utilized when finished.</li> <li>6. By reconsidering Rapid Transit between fixing each trouble spot, the advantages of Rapid Transit can be explored as its technology develops. Also, if the cost or availability of fuel prohibits much traffic after peak oil is reached, Rapid Transit becomes even more attractive because Rapid Transit can run on electricity instead of liquid petroleum-based fuels.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Anne E. Harding</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	453	Scott, Ron	Public	4/18/2005	<p>Madam -</p> <p>Re: I-70 PEIS, Tier 1 Draft</p> <p>I want to express my strong preference for a transit alternative of a fixed guideway system with supplementary enhanced bus operations for the corridor between Denver and Grand Junction. I sincerely believe this alternative will best meet our transportation needs and the majority's vision for the future. I don't believe a bigger, faster interstate freeway and its associated development is what people come to Colorado to experience. Rather, they come for the slower pace, beautiful natural features, and the ability to relax and enjoy nature. Please don't destroy what we have with "LA. Freeways"!</p> <p>Sincerely, Ron and Twila Scott</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	695	Sell, Larrice	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Colorado Department of Transportation U.S. Department of Transportation</p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>As a resident of Clear Creek County, Dumont Colorado and the I-70 corridor for 60 years, I wish to take a moment to state my concerns about the I-70 expansion.</p> <p>I was a witness to the congestion on then highway 6-40, with Sunday traffic backed up and stopped and go for hours. At that time, it was decided to make the highway I-70 with four lanes of traffic to solve this problem. Residents of the area endured the construction mess and inconvenience for several years as this supposed fix was put into place. However within a year of the opening, we once more saw traffic backups and it has gotten steadily worse over the years, to the point that many of us just stay home on the weekends, as we cannot even use our service road due to the congestion. The bigger the highway, the more people use it. Now I see two lanes of the interstate, and the service road backed up with "weekend" traffic. We are talking THREE LANES! If you add another lane, there will still be a backup of traffic. You are planning an expansion which is already obsolete. It makes no sense to spend all this money for a project to correct a TWO DAY problem, which will clearly solve nothing. The addition of one more lane obviously will correct nothing.</p> <p>In the past two or three years, I have seen the interstate closed due to landslides, and accidents for up to 24 hours. This has led to major problems for Colorado residents as well as through state traffic. At times it meant going over 200 miles out of the way to get around the closer. My point of this is that I believe you should be working out a second route across the state, which would solve this problem, as</p>	Written

well as the current congestion problems on I-70. The money you have spent on an unfixable problem, as well as the money set aside for the corridor could better be spent working out an alternate route to the ski areas, and across the state. Any number of things can close this road. Rock slides, avalanches, and God forbid forest fires. The latter could be a death trap to those of us who need the highway for escape. Enlarging the amount of people using this highway only means that more people are trapped in the mountains with no way to get out. This not only endangers the traveler but puts a real financial burden on the small communities in the mountains to house all the stranded motorists. A second highway would move some of these massive amounts of people to an alternate route, meaning less are stranded on the corridor.

It is my sincere hope you will take a second look at your proposal and spend the tax payers money a little more wisely.

Yours Sincerely

Larrice M. Sell  
Box 113  
Only Road 260  
Durmont, Colorado

Categorized Comment	675	I-70 Coalition	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	Attached is the final response to the I-70 PEIS that Gary Severson is presenting to CDOT today at 11:00 a.m. on behalf of the I-70 Coalition. I have also attached a copy of the transmittal letter and the May 19th meeting summary.	Email
					<p>The final response will also be posted on the NWCCOG web site.</p> <p>The next meeting of the I-70 Coalition will be Thursday, July 21 from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Location to be determined.</p> <p>Liz Finn NWCCOG/RRR</p> <p>Comments to the PEIS</p> <p>A. Concerns regarding PEIS</p> <p>The Draft PEIS is a comprehensive document. However, the Coalition felt there was one pervasive weakness in the PEIS and that was the inconsistent relationship between time, money and performance of the alternatives. All of CDOT's preferred alternatives meet stated traffic demand goals for 2025 and yet some of them reached capacity in 2030 and some in 2090. There was confusion as to what period should be used for planning purposes.</p> <p>Then there was the ambiguity of the "4-billion dollars or less" definition of economic reasonableness. The PEIS talks about approximately 2.2 billion dollars that could be made available for this project between now and 2025 and then defines economic reasonableness as less than 4 billion dollars. Again this relationship between time and money was confusing and it was felt that the economic reasonableness should be based on the money available for a period of time before the system reached capacity and not based on the arbitrary date of 2025.</p> <p>For example, it didn't matter whether the alternative reached capacity in 25 years or 85 years, it was evaluated using the same 4-billion dollar definition of economic reasonableness. This means that an alternative that would last for 25 years and cost 2.6 billion dollars (\$104 million per year for 6 lane highway) was reasonable, but an alternative that could last for up to 75 years and cost 4.4 billion dollars (\$58 million per year for the highway plus dual mode bus) was not reasonable.</p> <p>All of this made it very difficult for people to understand what they were getting for their money. Comments at the outreach meetings ranged from: "We need to know what the return on investment is for each alternative" to "in order to compare apples to apples it is vital to have a present-worth analysis, yearly costs must be considered" to "Whatever we do it has to last more than five years." These interests led to a commonly voiced opinion that whatever is to be done needs to be long term and forward thinking. The "Do it right" and "Need a combination" heard at the outreach meetings expressed a desire to choose an alternative that would economically address the problem for the long term.</p> <p>B. Questions needing answers prior to Final PEIS and ROD</p> <p>The Coalition Technical Team identified several areas it believed should be further analyzed prior to the selection of any alternative for the I-70 corridor. These questions were addressed in an April 13, 2005 meeting with CDOT and J.F. Sato and a report of this meeting was presented at the April 21, 2005 meeting of the Coalition. These questions are listed in Appendix V.</p> <p>C. The Coalition Alternative</p> <p>The Coalition's Regionally Preferred Alternative (Coalition Alternative) is a comprehensive long-range plan for the I-70 corridor that evolved from the Coalition consensus on the following twelve macro-planning elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transportation in the corridor is a system that must serve off-corridor communities as well as those on I-70. The system must be scenic in and of itself and not simply a way to move people and goods.</li> <li>2. The system must be multi-modal and include highway, transit, aviation, alternate routes and non-motorized components.</li> <li>3. The system must increase capacity.</li> <li>4. Planning must be expanded to at least 50 years. The system cannot become obsolete in 25 to 30 years.</li> <li>5. Planning for the components must be concurrent.</li> <li>6. Solutions should be incrementally implemented and address the problem areas first.</li> <li>7. No alternative should preclude any other component of transportation.</li> <li>8. Transit must be alluring and at least as fast as the highway component, corridor wide, networked to a system extending beyond the I-70 corridor and provide seamless connections to Denver International Airport (DIA).</li> <li>9. Building a rapid transit component must be an essential element of a long range, integrated transportation system in the region.</li> <li>10. Transit must move things in addition to people.</li> <li>11. Mitigation must be implemented with each solution. Any plan must provide for the immediate mitigation of existing environmental and community impacts.</li> <li>12. The artificial constraints of 25 years and \$4 billion do not address the needs of the corridor and should be eliminated as screening criteria.</li> </ol> <p>The Coalition Alternative is a stand-alone alternative and is not a derivative of any single alternative discussed in the PEIS; however, it is often described in terms of different parts of alternatives found in the PEIS.</p> <p>1. Overview of the Coalition Alternative</p> <p>The Coalition Alternative is a long-range, multimodal, sequenced alternative that addresses the transportation concerns of the I-70 corridor for at least the next 50 years. It is designed to align available funding with a sequenced plan to safely increase the long-range capacity of the corridor while addressing the concerns of local communities represented by the Coalition. The Coalition Alternative consists of five different components: highway, transit, aviation, alternate routes and non-motorized. Implementation of the Coalition Alternative requires balanced, concurrent planning of each of those components with constant community and Coalition involvement regarding the schedule, need and mitigation. This collaborative planning effort will allow local jurisdictions to coordinate their own improvements and land uses (i.e. future transit facilities, feeder lines, etc.) with CDOT's. Concurrent and joint planning for each of these components should preclude doing any work in the corridor that will have to be replaced to accommodate subsequent actions. In addition, the Coalition Alternative includes steps for the logical reevaluation of the capacity requirements, technological advancements and available financing for the corridor. This reevaluation will help determine the sequencing of subsequent actions. The Coalition Alternative envisions Coalition and member involvement for any and all future transportation decisions affecting the I-70 corridor.</p> <p>2. Sequencing and Financing the Coalition Alternative</p> <p>The Coalition Alternative sequences the implementation of various components of a long-term plan. This allows implementation to be directly related to available funding. The economic reasonableness of the plan is determined in terms of each of the sequenced actions. The Coalition, as stated in the MOU with CDOT, will use good faith best efforts to assist CDOT in its efforts to identify funding sources and mechanisms for constructing the Preferred Alternative identified in the ROD.</p> <p>3. The Highway Component</p>	

The Highway Component of the Coalition Alternative focuses on context sensitive design and has the goal to potentially achieve an equivalent of what today would be a six-lane capacity in terms of throughput. This ultimate capacity may be achieved with the actual construction of six lanes or by using alternate technology and/or improvements. The Coalition is opposed to the I70 corridor ever being physically expanded beyond a six-lane width.

The Coalition Alternative is broken down into sequences. Implementing items within a single sequence should be a coordinated effort between CDOT, the Coalition, and member jurisdictions. At the completion of each sequence it will be necessary to review the project need, (to increase capacity, improve accessibility and mobility, and decrease congestion) and the project purposes, (environmental sensitivity, respect for community values, safety, and ability to implement) to understand how the completed improvements are meeting project objectives and if any unanticipated consequences have occurred that require changes or additional mitigation.

All highway construction must include context sensitive design and special innovations to accommodate community values, safety, environmental concerns and the aesthetics that are so important to the people who live in and travel the corridor. All references to auxiliary lanes assume a six-lane design that can be integrated into the six-lane system when demand requires. All highway construction must accommodate integration of the transit, aviation and non-motorized components. Interchange improvements, including ramp metering, that are to be made to the following interchanges should be coordinated with adjacent or other highway construction during Sequences 1 and 2 to address safety, pinch points and achieve the best construction efficiencies.

- Morrison (No. 259)
- Lookout Mountain (No. 256)
- Hyland Hills and Beaver Brook (modify existing ramps and traffic control) (No. 247, 248)
- Base of Floyd Hill / US 6 (No. 244)
- East Idaho Springs (No. 241)
- Idaho Springs (No. 240)
- Fall River Road (connect to Frontage Road) (No. 238)
- Dumont (No. 235)
- Downieville (No. 234)
- Empire Junction (No. 232)
- Georgetown and Argentine St. (No. 228)
- Silverthorne (No. 205)
- Frisco / SH9 (No. 203)
- Frisco / Main Street (No. 201)
- Copper Mountain (No. 195)
- West Vail / Simba Run (No. 173)
- Avon (No. 167)
- Edwards and Spur Road (No. 163)
- Eagle and Spur Road (No. 147)
- Gypsum (No. 140)
- East Glenwood (No. 116)

#### a) Sequence 1

Sequence 1 is designed to address the non-highway construction and priority components aimed at operational efficiency, the safety and the primary choke points in the east end of the corridor, plus major safety issues in Eagle County. It assumes the currently programmed projects and priority components will proceed as scheduled or be accelerated. After implementation there is a need to evaluate project need, (to increase capacity, improve accessibility and mobility, and decrease congestion) and the project purposes, (environmental sensitivity, respect for community values, safety, and ability to implement) to understand how the completed improvements are meeting project objectives and if any unanticipated consequences have occurred that require changes or additional mitigation.

#### Non Highway Construction and Priority Components Aimed at Operational Efficiency

- Creation of a Transportation Management Association (TMA)
- Relocation of the Port of Entry in Downieville
- Slow Moving Vehicle Plan
- Truck Management Plan
- Peak Spreading Incentives
- Alternate Recreation Schedules
- Enhanced Traveler Information
- Enhanced Incident Management
- Mountain Corridor Parking Operations Plan
- Courtesy Patrol
- Ongoing Maintenance and Mitigation of Existing Impacts (e.g. noise, sediment, etc.)
- Frontage Roads, (244 to 241 - Kermit's to East Idaho Springs)

#### Currently Programmed Projects

- Straight Creek Sediment Control Actions
- Black Gore Creek Sediment Control Actions
- Hogback Parking Facility Expansion, (Jefferson County Input Needed)
- Rideshare Parking Lot Expansion and Improvements, (Gypsum, Edwards, Avon, Vail Transportation Center, Keystone)
- Rock Fall Mitigation on Georgetown Hill
- Lighting or Expansion of the Twin Tunnels
- Other Tunnel Operational Enhancements
- Eagle County Airport Interchange, (142 to 143)
- SH 9 Widening Frisco to Breckenridge

#### East End Corridor Highway Construction

- Auxiliary lane mp 259 to mp 253, Morrison/US 40 interchange to Chief Hosa interchange. 65 mph design speed, westbound only.

- Six-lane highway improvements mp 247 to mp 241, Floyd Hill to East Idaho Springs. 65 mph design speed, continuous three lanes east and westbound. Westbound narrows from three lanes to two lanes between mp 242 and mp 241. Eastbound expands from two lanes to three lanes between mp 241 and mp 242. New westbound 3-lane, 1400 ft Hidden Valley Tunnel bore between mp 243 and mp 242. New eastbound 3-lane south Side Twin Tunnel bore between mp 243 and mp 242. New eastbound 3-lane, 5500 ft Floyd Hill Tunnel bore between mp 245 and mp 243.

- Auxiliary lanes mp 234 to mp 232, Downieville Interchange to Empire Junction/US 40 interchange. 65 mph design speed, east and westbound, includes context sensitive design to minimize the footprint size and private property intrusion through the town of Lawson.

- Curve safety modifications mp 238 to mp 237, Fall River Road. Six-lane, not to preclude a 65 mph design.

#### Eagle County Safety Improvements

- Curve safety modifications mp 173 to mp 169, Minturn/Dowd Canyon area between West Vail and Eagle-Vail interchanges. 65 mph design speed, new east and westbound 3-lane tunnel. The on and off ramps to the Town of Minturn must remain on both sides of the proposed tunnel.

- Curve safety modifications mp 156 to mp 155, west of Wolcott. 65 mph design speed.

#### b) Sequence 2

Sequence 2 addresses construction from Bakerville to Glenwood Springs and is sequenced in this order to allow adequate time to evaluate the extensive construction completed during Sequence 1 in the east end of the corridor. It includes major improvements to the Eisenhower Johnson Memorial Tunnel (EJMT), and to the west of the EJMT it incorporates all remaining components of the six-lane 65 mph design alternative presented in the PEIS.

#### Bakerville Through EJMT Tunnel

- Six-lane highway improvements mp 215 to mp 213, third bore EJMT to be coordinated with the transit planning effort.
- Auxiliary lane mp 221 to mp 215, Bakerville Interchange to EJMT east portal. 65 mph design speed westbound only.

- Auxiliary lane mp 215 to mp 218, EJMT east portal to Herman Gulch Interchange. 65 mph design speed eastbound only.

- Interchange improvements, ramp metering, Loveland Pass, (No. 216.)

#### Improvements West of EJMT

- Auxiliary lanes mp 190 to mp 180, Vail Pass Interchange to Vail East Entrance Interchange. 65 mph design speed east and westbound.

- Auxiliary lane mp 168 to mp 167 Avon Interchange to Post Blvd. Interchange. 65 mph design speed, westbound only.

- Continuous six lanes, three eastbound and three westbound from Silverthorne to Frisco exit (across the exit 205 bridge).

#### c) Sequence 3

Sequence 3 addresses the Georgetown/Silver Plume Hill. Prior to implementation of Sequence 3, the results from Sequence 1 and 2 need to be examined to evaluate project need, (to increase capacity, improve accessibility and mobility, and decrease congestion) and the project purposes, (environmental sensitivity, respect for community values, safety, and ability to implement) to understand how the completed improvements are meeting project objectives and if any unanticipated consequences have occurred that require changes or additional mitigation. This same evaluation must occur upon

completion of Sequence 3 and prior to implementing Sequence 4.

- Auxiliary lanes mp 228 to mp 226, Georgetown interchange to Silver Plume interchange, 65 mph design speed, east and westbound, to include context sensitive design, such as cut and cover design with open sided, colonnaded lanes on the hillside that effectively mitigates rock fall hazard, preserves a continuous bike path through the area and avoids widening of the roadway footprint through Silver Plume and the Georgetown/Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District. This design is to mitigate noise, air quality, water quality and visual impacts.

- Interchange improvements:  
Silver Plume (No. 226)

d) Sequence 4

Sequence 4 completes six lane highway improvements from Idaho Springs to Bakerville and was sequenced last because of the extreme mitigation required in these areas.

- Six-lane highway improvements mp 226 to mp 221/218, Silver Plume to Bakerville/Herman Gulch. Six lane Components, 65 mph design speed continuous three lanes east and westbound.

- Six-lane highway improvements mp 241 to mp 228, East Idaho Springs to Georgetown. 65 mph design speed, continuous three lanes east and westbound, to include context sensitive design, such as fully structured lanes or tunneled lanes to mitigate noise, air quality, water quality and visual impacts through the Idaho Springs and Downieville, Dumont and Lawson areas.

- Idaho Springs segment to remain within existing footprint (current area of disturbance) of I-70.

#### 4. Transit Component

The Transit component of the Coalition Alternative is envisioned to be the long-term solution for the corridor. It will provide an addition to the highway system to address the transportation needs of the corridor into the foreseeable future. Transit must be at least as fast as the highway component, be corridor wide, provide seamless connections to DIA and be networked to a system extending beyond the I-70 corridor. Transit will allow for the movement of things in addition to people. The Transit Component will not necessarily be aligned with the Highway Component and actual alignment will be determined in the future based on such things as need, technology, financing, environmental impacts, community impacts and connectivity.

The Coalition strongly believes that now is the time to start researching and planning for transit within the corridor. At the same time, the Coalition believes that it currently has insufficient operational or technical knowledge about transit in a mountain corridor to reach agreement on a preferred technology, funding plan, operating agency, alignment and implementation by mid 2006 when the tier 2 level studies would commence. Without this research and planning there is the risk that whatever highway improvements are made will quickly reach capacity and there will be no system available to address the additional need.

The Coalition Alternative requires the immediate formation of an organization, such as a Transportation Management Association (TMA), to work with CDOT and the corridor communities to research and plan for future transit to service the corridor. Funding must be made available now to begin this process. The Coalition envisions that in the immediate future most of the planning and construction dollars will be spent on the highway component of the transportation plan, but as the highway gets closer to being built out more and more dollars will need to be spent on transit. See chart as example.

The Transit Component is the critical element of the long term planning for the corridor because only transit can address the long-term capacity requirements. This Component cannot be ignored because there is not currently a clear and specific plan for implementation. A commitment to fund planning for Transit must be included in the Record of Decision so that a clear and specific plan for implementation can be developed.

Transit design and construction must remain a continuing component of the corridor transportation system.

#### 5. Aviation Component

The Aviation Component of the Coalition Alternative must be developed to provide an alternative to the Highway Component and must be planned and integrated with all the other Components. Aviation improvements could benefit Colorado's Tourism Industry more than I70 improvements alone. Corridor airports offer significant potential due to their close proximity to mountain resort locations. Further development of these airports will be important to keep Colorado competitive in a challenging national and international tourism marketplace. All airports in the region, including Aspen, Eagle County, Garfield County, Kremmling and Leadville must be developed in a collaborative manner to optimize their positive contribution to the transportation system. There must be planned connectivity between the highways, transit, airports and resorts.

#### 6. Alternate Routes

One of the concerns most often heard during the Community Outreach Meetings was the question of what plans are being made regarding alternate routes from the Front Range to the mountains. These routes affect traffic on the I-70 corridor by providing an alternative means of getting to the corridor, especially when I-70 is closed, or by enabling travel to destinations outside the corridor. Because of this impact on the I-70 corridor they have been included in the Coalition Alternative. The Coalition desires to become involved in statewide planning efforts to coordinate the development of these alternate routes.

Concurrent planning of these routes, including integration with statewide economic development planning could optimize mobility and minimize conflicts during construction as well as enhance the economic well being of the state. As these routes are a part of the I-70 Transportation Plan the Coalition needs to have a voice in this parallel planning process.

#### 7. Non-Motorized

The creation of non-motorized access along and through the corridor is an essential part of the Coalition Alternative because it makes the corridor more attractive and reduces conflict with vehicles on I-70 and local roads. One of the values held by our mountain communities is the healthy life style that embraces cyclists and pedestrians. The PEIS needs to recognize this community value as part of the transportation plan and provide locations for these activities that are safe and accessible. Planning and development of non-motorized facilities must be concurrent with the planning and development of other components within the corridor.

#### Future Role of the I-70 Coalition

The two day I-70 Coalition retreat, conducted May 5 – 6, 2005, concluded with a discussion regarding the future of the I-70 Coalition. The following were the agreed upon roles:

1. The I-70 Coalition will continue to function. The Coalition will consider the formation of a Transportation Management Association or some other legally appropriate structure that can develop transit in the corridor and coordinate with other transit organizations in the state. We also endorse the development of a regional organization that can coordinate public/private implementation of the TDM components of our preferred alternative.

2. The I-70 Coalition should continue to work with CDOT regarding the responsibilities outlined in the MOU.

- Following identification of a Preferred Alternative, the Coalition will assist CDOT in CDOT's effort to determine "locally preferred context sensitive designs."

- The Coalition will help CDOT define construction and operational mitigation policies for the I-70 west corridor.

- The Coalition will work collaboratively with CDOT on future Tier 2 Environmental Studies that will be undertaken on a site-specific basis.

3. The Coalition will use good faith best efforts to identify private and public funding sources and mechanisms for constructing the regionally preferred alternative.

Additional roles for the I-70 Coalition may be identified in future.

Categorized Comment	117	Sharp, Dan	Public	1/19/2005	Dan Sharp, Grand Vista Hotel. We prefer that they look at a monorail system versus the lane adding proposals.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	112	Sharp, Dan	Public	1/19/2005	Good evening, my name is Dan Sharp, I'm with the Grand Vista Hotel here in Grand Junction, and I also work with the Horizon Drive Business Association.  I wanted to comment. First of all, can I just make this real quick and easy, and just say I ditto the first three commentators, all that they said? Just kidding. But I really do agree with it.  I'm very concerned as a business operator, one that deals with traveling guests that come over from the Grand Junction -- or, excuse me, from the East Slope, which is quite a bit of our tourism traffic in the Grand Junction area, along with leisure travelers worldwide, that we're not looking long-term.  My comments tonight are really more elementary than the earlier ones that have just commented.	Transcripts

I look at it from a bigger picture prospective. Colorado is a beautiful state, it's known worldwide, and I really think that a stronger emphasis needs to be placed on looking at the longer-term ramifications of having something like an AGS, monorail-type system that becomes an attraction. It becomes an attraction to the state, that enhances already the beauty and character that Colorado has.

And I'm not sure from the cost impact studies if any indication or any consideration was given to revenue enhancements or incremental revenue increases that are going to occur in the state, with tax bases that are going to help enhance that, not only from a building standpoint, but also from a long-term maintenance standpoint.

And, also, like I think the other lady had mentioned, from a privatization standpoint, seeking some private help if necessary.

But definitely from a tax base standpoint, from an incremental revenue increase to the state, with added tourism that would be received as a result of such a beautiful attraction, with an AGS type monorail system, I think that needs to be looked at again heavily before it's put up on this thing tonight as an eliminated alternative.

That's all I have.

Categorized Comment	121	Shenk, Cassandra	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Hi. My name is Cassandra Shenk. It's a pleasure to be here tonight. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.</p> <p>Just to tag along on what the last gentleman said, I just have a brief statement to make about, again, the vision and the timeline of the study. I'd like to urge the decision makers and the planner in this process to think beyond 2025 to consider not just the cost of the project itself in terms of implementation, but to consider life cycle costs, operation and maintenance costs, to think about what our commitment will look like in 2030 and 2040.</p> <p>If we consider for a moment why Colorado is such an attractive place to live, associated with that is our environment, our natural environment, our mountain environment, our innovation, our technology, our historical and cultural resources in this corridor. Those are the sorts of difficult things to weigh against this sort of a project. And so when you look at the cost-benefit of the project, and I see the 4 billion mark up on the graph, I really feel like we need to be thinking beyond the cost of the projects to what we want to be as Colorado, what we want for our children and our grandchildren.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	270	Shenk, Cassandra	Municipalities	2/2/2005	<p>Good evening. My name is Cassandra Shenk, and I'm here again to represent Silver Plume, a small town in the corridor, as well as to speak from the point of view of someone who works with environmental policy.</p> <p>Although this is a complex project, as evidenced by the documents we've gotten, much of it could be boiled down to simple choice, which is probably why most of us are here tonight. What should be the cornerstone of this transportation solution in the corridor? Should it be highway or should it be transit?</p> <p>In 1998, consensus was reached among 200 special-interest groups and governments along the corridor, ranging from truckers to the ski industry. They concluded that mass transit should be the cornerstone of the transportation solution. They concluded that for reasons that still exist today. Those include the lack of environmental impacts, the benefits to Colorado's economy, and our collective future.</p> <p>Since 1998, Governor Owens has been elected and appointed the director of CDOT, Tom Norton, and personal friends of theirs have explained to me that highway widening is, in their hearts, what they feel is best for the state of Colorado. They feel strongly about that. It's easy to see -- although it is my opinion that their influence has changed the direction of this project since 1998.</p> <p>As a NEPA specialist, I had to look at this project objectively and think about the public process and the role of public process. If, in 1998, true consensus was reached, what has happened since then to turn this project around so, in my view, dramatically, so that transit is now not preferred? It's hard for me to say because I haven't been around, but I do question the effectiveness of public process.</p> <p>And I question it further because a coalition was formed recently along the corridor. The reason the coalition has formed is because the coalition, comprised of seven counties and town governments, does not endorse any of the alternatives that are now being considered, particularly the preferred ones.</p> <p>Where there is a will, there is a way. Although I still have much work to do, my initial findings are that the budget projections for the I-70 transit solutions are under- -- or overstated, and resources that may be available in the private sector and federal government may not be acknowledged. It's a -- just to clarify, it was to be known, mass transit has been eliminated from the preferred grouping due to cost.</p> <p>Now, at the same time, I do believe that some of the issues raised tonight by Jo Ann Sorensen about air quality, and some of the other issues that have been raised point to understated environmental and economic impacts associated with the wider highway. NEPA requires that the decision maker at the federal level avoid unintended consequences of an action, that they ensure the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment.</p> <p>This is a policy-level document. I find the policy in here is one that states a short-term and least costly solution is preferred regardless of the impacts economically, environmentally, et cetera. By contrast, I would -- I would ask that the leaders of this project consider a policy that shows commitment to fostering Colorado's economic future and stature as a progressive state.</p> <p>I would appreciate a policy that shows the willingness to take an innovative look at this problem, to listen to the people of the state, and to choose technology rather than impacts to wildlife, lands, clean water and air in this very narrow corridor. The benefits of the transit system are vast. That is why consensus was reached in 1998.</p> <p>Thank you. I'll conclude my remarks. Thank you very much.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	319	Shenk, Cassandra	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Thank you for enduring with us through this long evening. I'll try to keep my remarks short. Tonight I'd like to talk about cumulative impacts and the importance of it to us and I think to you too.</p> <p>As we have discussed before, if you look at this project from a big picture, it's very clear that the crux of our environmental issues is right here in Clear Creek County, because the solutions across the corridor really do come into focus and revolve around construction through this county.</p> <p>Okay. So if -- it's important to us, I believe, that we recognize part of the reason we feel conflict is because we have an information gap. And I believe that part of this gap revolves around cumulative assessment.</p> <p>Cumulative assessment is difficult enough on its own, but when those critical environmental issues revolve around the intangible things like quality of life, ecosystem integrity, those sorts of things that are difficult to define, then you're very much challenged. And people who are -- who have worked on this project with JF Sato on this PEIS have had a huge challenge. So I think one of my textbooks actually encourages us to try to bridge this gap, that interviews are conducted with the local people, and so we can get an understanding of the connections and the interconnections with things like water quality, quality of life, that sort of thing.</p> <p>Let me give you an example. I think -- I live in a town where there's 100-year-old houses dry as a match box and clustered together. Our volunteer fire department has little to nothing because our volunteers are overwhelmed with highway response calls. If you understand what our community is like and some of the challenges that we have, how carefully balanced our pool of volunteers are, our schools, our housing situation, our historic features, and our ability to maintain them, add the quality of life and our overall socioeconomic health, we're right now struggling with a decision to close a school.</p> <p>So we really have a precarious situation here in our county. And I think if you could understand it, you might understand more why 15 years of construction causes so much concern. Now, I think we are both interested in helping the decision maker make his decision, and although at the end of the day, when the day comes, the federal agency has full authority to choose whatever option they feel is best.</p> <p>But, as I've stated before, one of the intentions of NEPA is that we avoid unintended negative consequences. Although the cumulative assessment section of the study is in process, I do believe that the difficulty of disclosing fully the economic benefits of -- the economy impacts, the socioeconomic impacts, the quality of life impacts, the intangibles hasn't been accurately addressed. I think that's one reason why you see all the concern here and hear all the upset people.</p> <p>So I propose that we focus on bridging that information gap, that we work together in whatever capacity we feel appropriate to start to come together and put this information in the text and make sure that the impacts aren't understated but are understood, aren't avoided but are brought to light and highlighted so that when the day comes that the decision maker is signing, he has full understanding of the implications of that decision.</p> <p>And I can't speak for everyone in Clear Creek, but I can speak for Silver Plume that we would really like to work with you on that.</p>	Transcripts

Thank you very much.

Categorized Comment	396	Shenk, Cassandra	Public	2/23/2005	Thanks again for letting me speak again tonight.	Transcripts
					<p>This evening I'd like to speak about the importance of this decision once more, but also give some specifics about what we believe needs to happen to the document to fix it in hopes that we can continue this process beyond the public hearing process.</p> <p>First of all, just to stress the importance of this document, this is a planning document, as I understand it, at a policy level that is to guide action along this corridor and the transportation planning for the next 50 -- maybe even 100 years -- well, 100's probably too much, but at least for 50 years. It's a very important document as far as outlining policy.</p> <p>And, again, from looking at the document, it appears that the decisions have been made based on costs -- capital costs, meeting the need in the short term, and ease of implementation. And I would urge the thinking to go broader than that and beyond that to questions such as: What is our view of affordability, not just for capital costs but for -- you know, life cycle costs as has been raised many times? Also, what is the cost benefit again for the state of Colorado? What is it that is in the best interest of we, as citizens, throughout this corridor?</p> <p>And, again, although highway widening might seem like in the short term a good fix, if you truly consider the narrow corridor and the lack of space, even if we were to preserve for transit, we've got major issues. Highway construction in itself is a very expensive and lengthy proposition and could have impacts on our economy, not just in Clear Creek but also in Summit. So again, that whole holistic sort of look at cost benefits for the transportation in this corridor I think needs to happen at the policy level and by key stakeholders involved in those discussions.</p> <p>Secondly, reading this document, there's a -- I have a couple of -- I think a couple of issues with the -- the amount of content that's devoted to a true analysis of the environmental impacts. For example, the purpose and needs statement has 40 pages in it. One half of one page is devoted to discussing environmental impacts. And even in the executive summary, there is no mention of the environmental crux of this problem, which is impacts in Clear Creek County, obviously, where 90 percent of your construction -- this is where your preferred alternative would occur.</p> <p>So, again, I think that we would really like to meet with you and help reframe the content in this document. Reading it as the decision maker, if I were to be one, I would come away with a very vague understanding of what are the true environmental impacts and how to weigh them out.</p> <p>Let me give you another example. The way that the environment impacts are portrayed in the executive summary content don't really -- although they disclose the spatial extent of impacts, they don't really disclose the intensity. So if you take something like acres of deer habitat that's impacted, well, of course, that's going to be greater for the AGS where you have 200 miles of a construction project versus 29 miles in Clear Creek County. So that kind of gets lost in the executive summary content.</p> <p>And I also believe that, even on page 1, Clear Creek County, the corridor should be mentioned. And it's not. It should be specifically mentioned impacts to that county are one big reason why this process has gone on since the '80s. And I think it's really worth giving that issue merit.</p> <p>And finally, I really hope that you hear all of the public comment and are open to it. I think it has been valuable. And I thank you for your time.</p>	
Categorized Comment	282	Siccardi, Joe	Public	2/16/2005	<p>To: Preparers of the PEIS for the I 70 Mountain Corridor</p> <p>These are personal comments as a citizen of Colorado and do not necessarily reflect those of the company for which I am employed.</p> <p>The undertaking of CDOT through Region 1 with regard to the I 70 Mountain Corridor has been a long and arduous one in an effort to find a solution to the transportation needs in the Corridor. A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) is without precedent in Colorado. Further to attempt to prepare such a document over a 160 mile corridor is a daunting task and is fraught with a great potential for failure. Being a PEIS requires that further environmental documents be prepared as project within the 160 mile corridor come to implementation. If nothing else the time and money put into the process in many ways is "too expensive" for the end result given that the time frame for the document remains static as the time for implementation of a solution narrows. The issues, in fact, have not changed over time -- I personally have heard the same comments over the last 20 or more years.</p> <p>Having said that, perhaps the most contentious portion of the corridor continues to be the most costly and congested area; specifically, that stretch through Clear Creek Canyon, Floyd Hill through the Eisenhower/Johnson Tunnels. Our state is committed to the I 70 Corridor having made a commitment to the corridor many years ago when the corridor was added to the Interstate System with the full support of the leaders we elected to serve us at that time. I dare say that without the corridor on the System, our State would not have developed nor flourished economically to the extent that it has. Curse or blessing can be debated but the facts stand indisputable. So, here we are and we cannot stick our heads in the sand!</p> <p>It is essential that we attempt to respond to the comments of the citizens in the Canyon but we also must look at the overall needs of the State and respond to the needs of the Vails, Copper Mountains, etc., that we have created. The community of Idaho Springs is rightly concerned with the potential negative effect that a six lane cross section might have on the community. It is my firm belief that a reasonable solution to providing the capacity for the highway and to minimize the impact to the community lies in and aerial solution through the town similar to the solution that allowed the development of I 70 through Glenwood Canyon. That type solution judiciously placed with safety in mind resulted in a minimized cross-section and in a final result that has been widely acclaimed nationally as an outstanding Civil Engineering Project!</p> <p>Similar accolades can come to a project through Idaho Springs. A similar solution utilizing a prestressed concrete segmental solution would, among other benefits, (1) minimize the construction aspects to Idaho Springs in that segments would be cast offsite and provide for a "just in time" delivery schedule of segments for the erection process, (2) Provide spans that would not create the typical vision of a viaduct section of the 1960's in that spans of 150 feet are commonplace in today's world as opposed to the 60 feet spans of the earlier time, (3) longer spans would relieve the congested appearance of cluttered columns along the length of the corridor, (4) current designs utilizing singular columns in a transverse direction rather than column bents would further add to the uncluttered look of piers, (5) framing the longitudinal structure into the pier caps of the transverse columns would allow for a lowering of the vertical profile of the roadway, (6) citizen input into the final aesthetics of the structure as related to design features such as project theme, lighting, shapes and textures would result in the community taking "ownership and pride" in the final result, (7) maintain to the maximum extent the existing corridor and reduce the need for further taking of property in Idaho Springs, and (8) minimize the interruption of traffic patterns within the corridor during the construction process in sum, the solution would be a win-win for all parties, including CDOT, Idaho Springs, the communities that rely upon efficient transportation to encourage skiers to visit their properties, the cross country travelers who want to traverse and recreate in this beautiful state and the citizens of Colorado generally.</p> <p>I have spent the greatest part of my life developing transportation in Colorado, including support for mass transit where that solution is appropriate. It is my belief that a solution of highway widening with an option for developing mass transit when the technology is more readily available and perhaps more affordable is the correct solution. Surely with no identifiable transit money available and with the citizens having spoken regarding a transit solution; e.g., CIFCA, CDOT is clearly showing sensitivity to the future in preserving future options for transit. Meanwhile, improvements are needed to relieve the congestion in the corridor.</p> <p>Joe Siccardi, P. E. 294 Flora Way Golden, Colorado 80401 jsiccardi@fggbridge.com</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	131	Simon, Peggy Jo	Associations & Special Interest Groups	1/12/2005	<p>My name is Peggy Jo Simon from the Clear Creek Economic Development. And on behalf of this corporation, I'd like to make a few comments. And then I'd like to read an analogy that might end tonight on a note.</p> <p>First, I want to say that the corporation finds that the 90-day response period is insufficient for the amount of information and details presented and considering the December holiday break; therefore, we ask that the response period be extended to allow for an examination and adequate response to this voluminous document.</p> <p>CCDC has reviewed not in detail the I-70 mountain corridor draft PEIS and finds it grossly lacking in the understanding of our community, its residents and businesses. We take issue with CDOT'S approach to this regarding the impacts this major construction project will have on our citizens who live at the eastern and western portions of the community. Again, we ask that the comment period be extended.</p> <p>I'd like to read an analogy. Let me tell you a story: I woke up this weekend and decided to go out and get some exercise. When I tried to move, it was taking twice the effort to get to where I was going than it should have.</p> <p>I went to my doctor, who diagnosed me with clogged arteries. I asked my doctor what the treatment was, and he said that I should undergo reconstructive surgery for the next 15 years at a cost of</p>	Transcripts



1-billion-plus dollars, causing not only great pain to me but also pain to my neighbors, and that when the procedure was finished, I would feel only slightly better than when I started.

I asked my doctor if there were any alternatives. He said just don't try to get around during the weekend rush hour and I would be fine.

Analogies sometimes help to evaluate a solution to a problem. Highway construction in itself is a problem because it is a victim of the movie Field of Dreams line, if you build it, they will come. And if you build out I-70, they will come and they will come and they will keep coming.

Borne out by CDOT's own analysis, traffic congestion will not be improved from today's weekend drive times by building a bigger highway. To improve the highway conditions only, consider transportation alternatives which measurably improve quality mass transit.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	332	Skeen, Cynthia	Public	2/9/2005	<p>The "problem" exists for maybe 5 months in the winter and 3 months in mid-summer to early fall. It exists for only two days a week during those months. The "problem" affects front range skiers and summer hikers and bikers. The affected group of motorists has flexibility in choosing when to leave or return home to the metro area. Many motorists have learned to plan ahead to avoid peak traffic congestion. More of them could learn. We Clear Creek County residents are affected by the congestion too, and we have learned how to plan ahead.</p> <p>The economic growth issue is not persuasive. The tourist industry provides low-paying jobs that they need to import undocumented workers to fill.</p> <p>C-DOT should not be in the business of making work for construction companies and asphalt companies. The cost to taxpayers is not worth it.</p> <p>I support minimal or no action for I-70. Correct the pinch points and see how that works. Look at improving 285.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	658	Georgetown Silver Plume Historic District Public Lands Commission	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/17/2005	<p>GEORGETOWN SILVER PLUME HISTORIC DISTRICT PUBLIC LANDS COMMISSION c/o Clear Creek County Administration Box 2000 Georgetown, CO 80444 Tel: 303 679 2309 Clear Creek County, Clear Creek Ranger District USFS, Colorado Division of Wildlife, Colorado Historical Society, Town of Georgetown, Town of Silver Plume, Historic Georgetown Inc. ..... May 17, 2005</p> <p>David Nicol, Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Ave. Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Dear Mr. Nicol,</p> <p>The Historic District Public Lands Commission (HDPLC) represents the land ownership and management jurisdictions and agencies for lands within the Georgetown Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District which lie outside the municipal boundaries of Georgetown and Silver Plume. The Commission is also the planning group for the Silver Heritage Area of Upper Clear Creek which extends from ridgeline to ridgeline along the main and south branch of Clear Creek. The Commission requested consulting party status to the Section 106 review of the I70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) as protection and enhancement of the many historic sites on the mountainsides is a primary purpose of the Commission. The Commission has reviewed the PEIS and is submitting the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose and need statement in the Executive Summary on Page ES 1 would indicate that the need will be balanced with consideration of the purposes: environmental sensitivity, community values, safety and ability to implement. It appears that the only items that were considered in determining the purpose in relation to the need were the technical feasibility and the cost; aspects of the ability to implement as stated in Section 2.4.1.1. All other elements of the purpose seem to have been deferred to Tier 2, after the primary decision on an alternative has already been made. The Commission does not feel that decision is in keeping with the intent of the NEPA process (as embodied in Article I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969).</li> <li>Pertinent indirect effects which may constitute "constructive use" are well defined in FHWA Regulation 23 CFR 771.135(4)(p). The PEIS appears to have minimized these indirect effects and not identified potential constructive uses by alternative. Specifically within the HDPLC jurisdiction the commission notes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Noise: No noise measurements appear to have been taken west of Silver Plume. Noise impacts the homeowners along the Silver Valley Road (frontage road), and drastically impacts the enjoyment of the Bakerville-Loveland Trail, a part of the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail, the Herman's and Watrous Gulch Trails. Additional noise will also impact the HDPLC Trail system within the Landmark District. Any additional noise in these areas would appear to fall under 23 CFR 771.135(4)(p)(i) and constitute a potential constructive use with certain alternatives.</li> <li>B. Visual effects. The Commission notes that visual effects consider horizontal widening to have a minimal visual effect. HDPLC lands and trail system lie on the mountainsides within the Landmark District but above the valley floor. The trail system includes the historic roadbeds of Union Pass, Silver Creek Wagon Road, Notch Trail, 7:30 Mine Road and the Argentine Central Railroad Grade. Horizontal widening has a greater and more negative impact in the view from these trails than a vertical contrast. All preferred alternatives include substantial horizontal widening. Horizontal widening would "substantially detract from the setting of a park or historic resource which derives its value in substantial part to its setting" (23 CFR 4(p)(4)(ii)). The setting of the Landmark District was considered a significant element in its designation. Noise mitigation, i.e., noise walls and berms, may cause severely detrimental visual effects in the Landmark District and Heritage Area and will not alleviate the noise problems on the mountainsides.</li> <li>C. Wildlife protection is another concern of the HDPLC which is addressed in 23 CFR 4(p)(4)(v) which appears to be ignored in the PEIS. The area to the west of the Interstate north of Georgetown is identified as a Production Area, Winter Concentration Area and Winter Range by the Colorado Division of Wildlife (Colorado Division of Wildlife, Colorado Species Distribution BIGHORN SHEEP, 2004 information at <a href="http://ndis.nrel.colostate.edu/tp/index.html">http://ndis.nrel.colostate.edu/tp/index.html</a>). Additional noise, and additional road salts, would be detrimental to the life cycle processes of the sheep herd.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The survey of historic sites does not extend west of Silver Plume. The Graymont/Bakerville area is ignored. This information needs to be included in the document.</li> <li>The mitigation measures are unclear. One section indicates that noise mitigation could include horizontal and vertical alignment shifts. Another section indicates they are too expensive. Mitigation policies reference standard design except "in isolated instances" and then indicates that Context Sensitive Design will be used. Design sensitive areas are not, but should be, identified. Innovative design might address many of environmental and community issues. The wildlife mitigation indicates the wildlife crossings will be constructed in keeping with the ALIVE Agreement. In the chart for specific wildlife mitigations, however, crossings will be constructed "if practical."</li> <li>Safety issues are deferred to Tier 2 and all preferred alternatives have the highest accident and mortality potential. Geologic hazards exist throughout this area. Additional pavement appears to be an additional target zone. Many fatal accidents take place on the Georgetown Silver Plume incline and the approaches to the Eisenhower Tunnel. Specific safety design should be undertaken in these areas.</li> </ol> <p>The Commission urges that that safety, environmental sensitivity and community values be fully considered as meaningful factors at the Tier 1 level in order to balance the purpose and need prior to the determination of an alternative. The Commission requests a supplemental document to address these critical issues.</p> <p>Sincerely, Matthew D. Skeen Chairman</p> <p>cc: Georgianna Contiguglia, State Historic Preservation Officer Dan Corson, Amy Pallante, State Office of Historic Preservation Carol Legard, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation Ann Pritzlaff, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation Lysa Wegman-French, National Park Service James Lindberg, National Trust for Historic Preservation Cecelia Joy, CDOT Project Manager Mary Ann Naber, FHWA, Federal Preservation Officer U.S. Senator Wayne Alard U.S. Senator Ken Salazar U.S. Representative Mark Udall Colorado Senate President Joan Fitz-Gerald Colorado Representative Tom Plant</p>	Written

Categorized Comment	64	Slattery, Thomas M.	Public	1/12/2005	<p>1. I think a rail system is the only worthwhile long range solution for the Corridor. The proposed widening will be obsolete when built in my opinion. Accommodating so many vehicles on the roadway is only the beginning of the problem. Parking them in the mountain towns and resort areas will be the real problem.</p> <p>2. I am astonished that local planning agencies, statewide, continue to project unrealistic population growth for the state. This state is effectively out of water resources as the current drought has proven. We are hard pressed to provide required flows to the states of Kansas and Nebraska and may be required to provide an extreme amount of water to maintain Glen Canyon Dam. The "if we build it they will come" philosophy has passed its effective time.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	514	Smith, Delbert	Public	5/18/2005	<p>You cannot build enough lanes on I-70 to prevent the gridlock and potential gridlock in the coming years. You need to look at alternatives to highway and vehicle travel. The time is coming that we are going to have to move more people by mass transit and give up our idea of 1 person/vehicle mentality.</p> <p>There is no practical way to add lanes to Glenwood Canyon without massive damage. The existing right of way can be used for mass transit.</p> <p>Monorail, even though possibly more expensive at the initial spending, would and will be a better and cleaner way to transport masses from the front range to the west.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	512	Town of Georgetown	Municipalities	5/10/2005	<p>May 10, 2005 Letter #05-003</p> <p>Tom Norton Executive Director CDOT 4201 E. Arkansas Avenue Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>David Nicol Division Administrator - Colorado Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue, Suite 180 Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Dear Mr. Norton and Mr. Nicol:</p> <p>Please accept this letter as additional comments on the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). We may expand and reiterate upon these preliminary comments prior to the May 24, 2005 comment deadline. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments and we look forward to working with CDOT and FHWA on the optimal solution for the future I-70 mountain corridor.</p> <p>1. The PEIS says that CDOT will balance the purpose and need in their preferred alternatives. However we find that the preferred alternatives are based primarily on CDOT's ability to implement the alternatives and there is insufficient balancing of the need with the stated purposes of community values, environmental sensitivity, and safety.</p> <p>2. Our preferred alternative is a high-speed, elevated, mass transit alternative, either the Advanced Guideway System (AGS) in Alternative #3 or some other high speed, elevated, mass transit alternative. We also support specific, targeted highway improvements to address safety aspects and bottlenecks such as the Twin Tunnels. The expansion of I-70 to six lanes of highway throughout Clear Creek County would expand the detrimental impacts on Georgetown and further erode our historic resources. We do not believe that road building has a long term or significant effect on congestion, but that public transportation or mass transit investments can reduce congestion.</p> <p>3. Another reason for supporting a mass transit alternative such as the AGS is there is some evidence that investments in public transportation projects produce 19% more jobs than does building new roads. The State of Colorado and the FHWA should be very interested in the increased job creation given the current national and state economy. Such information is also evident in Table 3.9-9 on page 3.9-14 of the PEIS.</p> <p>4. Safety does not appear to be a priority in the PEIS for any of the preferred alternatives. The Georgetown-Silver Plume Hill has proven to be deadly because of geologic hazards. Geologic hazards are not considered a determining factor for alternative choices in the PEIS. What are the plans to improve safety in this area?</p> <p>1 "Setting the Record Straight — Transit, Fixing Roads and Bridges Offer Greatest Job Gains," Decoding Transportation Policy and Practice #11, Surface Transportation Policy Project, Washington, DC, www.transact.org (copy attached)</p> <p>5. We object to the apparent lack of any life cycle costing analysis in the I-70 PEIS. A search of all 1377 pages of the PEIS and its appendices revealed only one mention of the word life-cycle and that was in relation to wildlife, not costs. Had CDOT and J.F. Sato and Associates performed a rigorous life-cycle costing analysis of each alternative, especially for a longer time frame than 20 years, we believe the cost effectiveness index of transit alternatives would have compared much more favorably with the highway alternatives and the ranking would have been much different. We believe that a comprehensive life-cycle costing analysis of each alternative should be done before a preferred alternative is selected.</p> <p>6. Noise from I-70 is a very important issue to the Town of Georgetown and our residents and property owners. The AGS alternative is one of the most quiet alternatives and other mass transit alternatives are as quiet, so this is another important reason for our favoring of mass transit solutions over building more highway lanes. It is unclear how environmental and community values will be used in the selection of preferred alternatives. We believe that the increased noise constitutes a "constructive use" under the Section 4(f) regulations.</p> <p>7. As Cynthia Neely, the Town's Planning Coordinator at the time, wrote in a letter of August 9, 2001, there are many Section 4(f) resources in the Georgetown area including the Georgetown-Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District, the former BLM lands granted to the Town, Division of Wildlife and the Colorado Historical Society, Georgetown Lake recreation area, and bighorn sheep viewing areas. We are adamantly opposed to any alternative which directly or indirectly harms or diminishes these important resources. We believe that all of the preferred alternatives in the PEIS have an adverse effect on these resources and mitigation costs have not been sufficiently estimated. Mitigation policies for sensitive areas are not established in the PEIS. We are also concerned that there may have been new Section 4(f) resources established in Georgetown since the scoping was done in 2000-2001.</p> <p>8. We do not believe that mitigation on the effects of all of the alternatives on the Town of Georgetown and its residents and property owners is sufficiently addressed in the PEIS. Page ES-50 of the PEIS says that mitigation policies and strategies will be shaped to the preferred alternative as a result of public comment and review of the Draft PEIS and will be presented in the final EIS. However, leaving the evaluation and estimation of costs for mitigation to the subsequent Tier 2 process makes it impossible for us to understand the implications of all the alternatives and difficult for us to make decisions on the different alternatives. We request a clarification of mitigation policies within an Historic Landmark District.</p> <p>9. Impacts during construction are a tremendous concern to the Town of Georgetown and Georgetown businesses. Most of the details to address construction impacts, mitigation, and strategies are left to the Tier 2 studies, so it is difficult for us to comment on the different alternatives if we cannot understand how the construction impacts and mitigation of a 15 year construction process for each alternative might affect us. We request a study of economic impacts of construction on Clear Creek County prior to the selection of a preferred alternative.</p> <p>10. The use of person miles of travel (PMT) in the denominator does not fully take into account congestion caused by truck and freight traffic, thus the denominator is invalid and it skews the use of the cost effectiveness index (ref Section 2.3.7.7 — page 2-114). Much of the traffic generated for mountain resort towns is generated by the vigorous home building industry and the materials and supplies which are trucked into and within the mountain corridor to support this burgeoning industry.</p> <p>11. In December, 2004, Governor Bill Owens announced a five point plan for increased transportation spending, including a new proposal to issue \$1.7 billion of transportation bonds. In a Rocky Mountain News article of December 2, 2004, CDOT spokeswoman Stacey Stegman was quoted as saying "The Transportation Commission and CDOT would want to work cooperatively with our local transportation planning partners to determine their priorities and develop the best possible list of critical projects." We hope that CDOT will follow through on that vital partnership and pay great attention to the Town of Georgetown comments and desires while developing its preferred alternative for the Final EIS. We are opposed to building standard three lanes in each direction and support a high-speed, elevated mass transit alternative.</p> <p>12. We are concerned whether or not CDOT will need to condemn any private or Town of Georgetown land for any of the proposed alternatives. We know that the Toll House (Mine Manager's House) may need to be relocated to avoid conflicts. We are not sure that CDOT's authority to condemn land extends to the Town of Georgetown land inasmuch as we are a Territorial Charter Town incorporated in 1868 before the State of Colorado became a state.</p> <p>13. Regarding whatever construction is ultimately selected, we would request that all construction in the Georgetown area be completed prior to 2010 which is Georgetown's sesquicentennial. Given the events and attractions that our 150 year anniversary will bring, we would appreciate it if construction in the area</p>	Written

could be completed by 2018.

14. There are contradictions in the mitigation discussion in the PEIS whether variations to the standard CDOT designs will be possible or whether variances or "context sensitive design" can be used. We would respectfully submit the Georgetown-Silver Plume National Landmark District and the Georgetown hill area are places where "context sensitive design" is appropriate and we hereby request that it be used in these areas.

15. Georgetown is a consulting party for historic resources and will be submitting a separate letter regarding the review for historic resources.

16. We are concerned about possible impacts on the area's bighorn sheep population. Salt residue by the interstate attracts the sheep and both the residue and noise impacts may affect the sheep as identified by the Colorado Division of Wildlife. The Georgetown area is a critical calving area for the sheep and Georgetown was the first wildlife viewing station for viewing bighorn sheep. This resource is a vital part of our local economy and community.

17. We are concerned about the impact that a roadway expansion, retaining walls, and cantilevers will have on the Historic Landmark District. Of particular concern is the destruction or relocation of the bicycle path between Georgetown and Silver Plume. Not only is this path an important recreational resource, it is also an emergency access for our police and fire departments to travel between the two towns when I-70 is closed or congested.

18. We would like to request that CDOT do further review and consideration of an incline tunnel as an alternative to the Georgetown Hill roadway. Rockfall, noise, and viewshed impacts around Georgetown all point to a renewed consideration of a possible incline tunnel alternative.

Finally, we appreciate the time extension to May 24th that was previously granted and we look forward to working with you on the decisions and implementation of I-70 improvements. Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Robert C. Smith, Police Judge/Ex-Officio Mayor  
Ernest Durn, Police Judge, Pro-Term  
Barb Jackson, Selectman  
Lee Behrens, Selectman  
John Jackson, Selectman  
Gary Haines, Selectman  
Robert Hodge, Selectman

cc: The Honorable Bill Owens, Governor  
The Honorable Mark Udall, U.S. House of Representative  
The Honorable Joan Fitz-Gerald, Colorado State Senate  
The Honorable Tom Plant, Colorado House of Representatives  
Jeffrey Kullman, CDOT Region 1 Transportation Director  
Jean Wallace, PE, FHWA, Lakewood, CO  
Dan Corson, State Historic Preservation Officer  
Clear Creek County Board of Commissioners  
Holland Smith, Clear Creek County Planner

Categorized Comment	483	Town of Georgetown	Municipalities	4/26/2005	Town of Georgetown P.O. Box 426 Georgetown, Colorado 80444 (303) 569-2655  April 27, 2005  David Nicol, Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Ave., Lakewood, CO 80228  Dear Mr Nicol,  The Town of Georgetown, as a consulting party to the Section 106 review of the I70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) and representative of the Georgetown Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District, has reviewed the PEIS in detail. We are aware that the Section 106/110 process under the National Preservation Act is not identical, but rather parallel, to the NEPA process which requires the Environmental Impact Study. The town is submitting the following comments and concerns for consideration in the continuing discussions with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), the State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) on both the Tier 1 consultation for Section 106/110 and NEPA process as it addresses historic resources  1. The Area of Potential Effect (APE). The PEIS defines the APE as the viewshed of I70. We concur with that definition. Of concern is the statement on page 3.15.2 which indicates that "APE for Tier 2 may not be the same." The Town wishes to see the agreed upon APE maintained. It also concerns the Town that the APE for Section 4(f) consideration seems to revert to 500 feet from the interstate rather than viewshed.  2. Reconnaissance Survey. The Revised Reconnaissance Survey is an adequate sampling of the resources within the Landmark District, but only a sampling. The survey is inadequate in the history of the area and is focused only on structures omitting many mining sites which are the basis of the District designation. We urge an appropriate context be written and individual sites, including mining, be researched at the Tier 2 level prior to the final determination of any Tier 2 action. That commitment may be addressed in the Programmatic Agreement.  3. Assessment of effects. The Executive Summary page ES-37 concludes, "At the Tier 1 conceptual level of study, direct effects on historic properties (including districts and historic areas) in the Corridor have the potential to be avoided and minimized. Final determination of direct, noise and visual effects on the significance of historic properties will be made in Tier 2." That conclusion ignores the requirement to consider "constructive use" at the Tier 1 level and is in conflict with the Section 4(f) law quoted on page 3-16-1 which states "Constructive use occurs when the transportation project does not incorporate land from a Section 4(f) resource, but the project's proximity impacts are so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired..." That is certainly the case for this transportation project in the Georgetown Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District. Constructive use should be considered at Tier 1 and an alternative identified which "avoids and minimizes harm" to the historic resource. This standard has not been met. The assessment of effects, including constructive use effects of noise, visual, cumulative assessment of effects, including constructive use effects of noise, visual, cumulative and construction in addition to the direct physical effects, must be undertaken at the Tier 1 level to be considered in the choice of an alternative. Tier 2 is too late as the alternative will all ready be chosen.  Page 3.15.3 of the PEIS states "Criteria for addressing effects on historic resources were developed with concurrence from the Committee." The Town does not know to which Committee that refers. We do not concur with the criteria which are being used to assess effects.  a. Physical: Section 106 review is concerned with the historic landscape, the historic setting. The NEPA review considers the current landscape and limits the physical effects criteria in the PEIS to structures. The Landmark District itself is an historic site and the importance of its setting is recognized in its designation. The laying of more asphalt or tracks, extensive retaining walls, noise walls, and moving exits are physical impacts to the District. The Table on page 3.15.3 makes it appear that all alternatives have the same physical effects. Common sense would say otherwise.  b. Noise: The noise standards for Section 106 and NEPA differ. CDOT has chosen 66 decibels, an FHWA/NEPA Activity Level B, as a standard for noise in the District. Under Section 106 a noise level which does not diminish the quality of the resource is determined through consultation. That consultation has not taken place. Even under NEPA, however, the Table 3.12.2 shows that areas where a level of serenity is important to the purpose of the place should have an Activity Level A of 56 decibels. The Landmark District is dependent on heritage tourism and outdoor recreation. A group walking tour can not be conducted with surrounding noise at a 66 decibel level. We would submit that Activity Level A is more appropriate to the District. The only mitigation suggested for noise is sound walls which add visual intrusion.  c. Visual: Section 3.13 of the PEIS examines two aspects of visual effects: visual contrast (a change in height, color and texture) and scenic views. We concur that these are two aspects of the visual effects. However, with only these criteria a ten lane highway on grade with 4 foot concrete jersey barriers would have less visual effect than a finely designed guideway. Under those guidelines the Glenwood Canyon highway and the "picture bridge" could never have been built. Although it is not directly stated it is presumed that vertical contrast is inherently negative and should be avoided. Indeed the mitigation on page 3.13.21 recommends using structures with a horizontal emphasis.  Section 106 review of visual effects concentrates on effects that diminish the integrity of the historic setting. We would suggest that, as difficult as it is to measure, design must be a component of visual impact. The FHWA acknowledges this idea in their publication "Flexibility in Highway Design." Innovative design, the best of 21st century engineering, could compliment and be compatible with the 19th century historic mining setting.  The discussion of view in the PEIS is limited to the motorists' view of the landscape and the view of the road from adjacent properties. The most common view, with the greatest visual impact, is not included: the motorists' view of the road itself. One of the successes of Glenwood Canyon is that the motorist <th>Written</th>	Written
---------------------	-----	--------------------	----------------	-----------	--	---------

sees a two lane road and remains largely unaware of the oncoming lanes. In consideration of the motorist view of the road an increase of horizontal width has a visual impact equal to any increase in vertical dimension, perhaps even greater.

The visual impact study does not include the impact of mitigation measures: sound walls, construction of retaining walls and shadowing of historic properties. Given all these additional factors the analysis of the visual impacts in Table 3.15-7 is inaccurate.

d. Cumulative: The cumulative impact discussion in the PEIS in Chapter 4, page 4-35, fails to acknowledge the major impact of the initial construction of I70 on the Landmark District. Section 106 review would base the discussion of cumulative effects on the pre I70 construction setting. The PEIS cumulative impact discusses only the potential future visual and physical impacts based on the inadequate criteria described above. No other impacts are discussed. The Summary of Cumulative Impacts, Table 2-27, simply says "Impacts from indirect disturbance (noise and visual impacts) to historic districts and landmark areas (mining related) to areas previously displaced/disturbed by original I70 construction would cause cumulative effects." No Section 106 cumulative impact study has been done for historic resources.

e. Construction: The limited discussion of construction impacts does not include any discussion of the fragile nature of historic resources in areas where construction may include blasting and excessive noise. The potential takings within a construction zone are not addressed. The economic impact of construction to heritage tourism within Clear Creek County is not addressed.

4. Comparison of alternatives. There is no meaningful comparison of alternatives. Table 2-26 on Page 2-124 would be significantly altered by use of a full set of criteria for assessing the effects and by consideration of all pertinent effects. The Section 4(f) line, which includes historic resources, simply says "similar" across all alternatives. The effects of all alternatives are not "similar."

The preferred alternatives described in the PEIS have the greatest adverse impacts on the Landmark District. The bus in guideway and the standard design six lane widening at 65 mph, 55 mph or reversible lanes, have the substantial noise and construction impacts. Their visual impacts analysis is marred by the approach that nothing horizontal is visible. As Tables 2-25, 2-26, 2-27 describe, combination alternatives have the greatest adverse impacts not only to the historic resources, but also to environmental sensitivity, community values and cumulative effects. According to Table ES-4, all preferred alternatives have the most substantial adverse effects during the proposed 15 year construction period. For the future of Colorado, we must be able to do better than this.

5. Mitigation. Mitigation was examined for consistency and commitment in the various impact sections in addition to a review of the mitigation summary in Section 3.19. In regard to the Section 106 resources, the mitigation appears to be inconsistent. In Section 3.19.2, Mitigation Policies, Policy IB states "Use standard design parameters. In isolated instances, consider variances..." IC states "Utilize the principles of Context Sensitive Design". Although these statements are not in total opposition they are not consistent with each other. The FHWA publication on Flexibility in Highway Design is clear that Context Sensitive Design is most frequently a deviation from "standard design". Which policy will apply?

Further the mitigation section indicates on page 3.19-1 that detailed planning has been undertaken in restrictive locations such as Georgetown and Silver Plume, yet IC under policies states there will be "significant involvement of affected communities in determining the ultimate footprint, aesthetic elements and other features germane to the alternative". How can both be true? There is no consistency.

Mitigation options available are also severely limited by the Tier 1 PEIS. There is no discussion of reduced width widening, very limited discussion of tiered highways or underdecking. Tunnels are eliminated. The discussion of mitigation for Historic Resources in Section 3.19 -13 relates to noise impacts only.

Commitment is recorded under 3.19.2 #2 which states that the Programmatic Agreement between the consulting parties for Section 106 will be applied to Tier 2. There is no apparent application of the Section 106 and Section 110 requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Section 4(f) and Section 4(p) requirements of the Transportation Act to the federal undertaking which constitutes the Tier 1 action of determining an alternative.

The Executive Summary, on page ES 1, indicates that the "need" of increased capacity, improved mobility, and decreased congestion will be addressed in a manner which provides for the environmental sensitivity, community values (including historic resources), improvements to safety and ability to implement. Of these, only ability to implement has been utilized in determining the preferred alternatives. In summary, the Town of Georgetown believes that the balance between the need and purposes for the PEIS has been disregarded in the Tier 1 Draft PEIS with the consequence of adverse effects on historic resources. As a consulting party, the Town would recommend that a full Section 106 and 110 review of the Tier 1 draft PEIS be completed prior to the selection of an alternative in the final PEIS and adoption of a Programmatic Agreement for Tier 2. The Town will continue to discuss and review the Programmatic Agreement, however, significant questions remain to be addressed at the Tier 1 level.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Robert C. Smith Joan Eaton  
Mayor Design Review Commission

cc: U.S. Senator Wayne Allard  
U.S. Senator Ken Salazar  
U.S. Representative Mark Udall  
Colorado Senate President Joan Fitz-Gerald  
Colorado Representative Tom Plant  
Georgianna Contiguglia, State Historic Preservation Officer  
Dan Corson, Amy Pallante, State Office of Historic Preservation  
Carol Legard, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation  
Ann Prinzlaff, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation  
Lysa Wegman-French, National Park Service  
James Lindberg, National Trust for Historic Preservation  
Cecelia Joy, CDOT, Project Manager  
Mary Ann Naber, FHWA, Federal Preservation Officer

Categorized Comment	445	Snyder, George R.	Public	4/18/2005	As a resident of northeast Georgetown, I oppose any plan to widen I-70 in the Georgetown area because the widening process will almost certainly include blasting with dynamite. I live at the base of Saxon Mountain. Several years ago a boulder the size of a football field cracked loose from the mountain, shattered itself on Saxon Mountain Road and dropped a piece the size of a small yacht onto the field next to the condos where I live. The field now contains three rows of newly-built town homes. The crack is still visible on Saxon Mountain. I do not believe it unreasonable to fear that blasting vibration will cause another slab to break loose, crushing the town homes upon its fall and killing occupants therein. The biggest clog on I-70 in this region is Exit 232. I propose that CDOT consider a new plan to connect Empire to the Central City Parkway and closing the exit to I-70.	Form
Categorized Comment	531	Mill Creek Valley Historical Society	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/4/2005	Mill Creek Valley Historical Society P.O. Box 84 Dumont, Colorado 80436  May 4, 2005  David Nicol, Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration 12300 W. Dakota Ave. Lakewood, CO 80228  Dear Mr. Nicol:  The Mill Creek Valley Historical Society requested and received Consulting Party status for the Section 106 review of the I-70 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. In addition to owning, maintaining and interpreting the Mill City House, the Coburn Cabin and the Dumont Schoolhouse in the Dumont area, we are partners with the Clear Creek County Open Space Commission in planning and management of the arastra property in Dumont. In addition, we supported the designation of nearby county-owned land as Open Space specifically because it serves as habitat and lambing area for the Clear Creek bighorn sheep herd. These properties are important assets not only for our area, but also for Clear Creek County and the state of Colorado.  As we reviewed the Draft PEIS several concerns stand out:  It is not apparent how the purposes of environmental sensitivity and community values were balanced with technical feasibility and cost when the selection of the preferred group of alternatives was made. The NEPA process, as well as the Colorado Department of Transportation Director, asserted that this balancing process would occur. We request that the considerations, the process and the results of the deliberations be disclosed.  Section 4 (p) of the Transportation Act defines effects which may constitute constructive use of protected properties. We found no discussion of the indirect effects and possible constructive use of	Written

the properties in our area. We expected to see each alternative's impacts disclosed at Tier 1, not delayed to Tier 2 after the critical decisions have been made.

We could find no disclosures about the effects of noise and vibration on our historic properties. The preservation and enjoyment of these properties is further threatened by the expansion that will be necessary for any of the preferred alternatives.

We find the wildlife discussion in the Draft to be inadequate. Sheep Keep lands to the east of Dumont were designated to protect the lambing area of the bighorn sheep. The impacts of noise and road maintenance activities were not disclosed. There has already been significant wildlife loss (bighorn sheep, elk, deer and a Yellowstone wolf) and habitat fragmentation caused by I70.

The confusing discussion about mitigation should not be accepted. While possible strategies were identified, there are no firm commitments. The ALIVE program is referenced, but not found in the document. We recommend that mitigation plans be disclosed and available for public review at this stage of study. Our fear is that if delayed to a later phase, CDOT will again find itself without funding to meet its obligation on this issue.

We request that these topics be thoroughly addressed at the Tier 1 level so that we as consulting parties and the general public will have the confidence that our public agencies are meeting the intent of NEPA.

Sincerely,

Jo Ann Sorensen, President  
MII Creek Valley Historical Society

cc: Georgianna Contiguglia, State Historic Preservation Officer  
Dan Carson, State Office of Historic Preservation  
Amy Palante, State Office of Historic Preservation  
Carol Legard, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation  
Ann Prinzlaff, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation  
Lysa Wegman-French, National Park Service  
James Lindberg, National Trust for Historic Preservation  
Cecelia Joy, CDOT, Project Manager  
Mary Ann Naber, FHWA, Federal Preservation Officer  
Senator Wayne Allard  
Senator Ken Salazar  
Congressman Mark Udall  
Senator Joan Fitz-Gerald  
Representative Tom Plant

Categorized Comment	265	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	2/2/2005	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I'm primarily concerned with the construction impacts of all of CDOT's preferred alternatives that have been disclosed so far. I'm making comments about Section 3.1 of the draft.	Transcripts
					<p>Specifically, I'm concerned about the air-quality discussions for Clear Creek County. Table 3.1-2 indicates that while CDOT and FHWA are operating with factual data for Garfield, Eagle, Summit, and Jefferson counties, there's no empirical data for Clear Creek County. As a resident of Clear Creek County, which is expected to experience 90 percent of the construction for this corridor for 15 years, I find the lack of actual data to be a flaw.</p> <p>In addition, the discussions on pages 3.1-6 through 3.1-8 appear to focus on the conditions in the year 2025. There is no discussion of the quantifiable impacts during the 15-year construction period, specifically in Clear Creek County.</p> <p>We're concerned about the effects of the construction equipment, automobile and truck emissions that will be concentrated in our communities, not only in the year 2025 but also during the 15 years of construction, the years when the I70 traffic will be diverted to our community streets and to our neighborhoods when as many as 50,000 vehicles per day, according to your Chart B-9, could be contaminating the air by our Carlson Elementary School in Idaho Springs and through our residential areas in Idaho Springs, Dumont, Lawson, Downieville, and Silver Plume, areas where we know there are concentrations of low income residents.</p> <p>We request a more understandable disclosure of the amount of daily traffic that will be diverted past our school and through our residential areas. We request disclosure of anticipated health effects.</p> <p>We know that a 2000 study showed that children who are living within 250 yards of streets or highways with 20,000 vehicles per day are six times more likely to develop all types of cancer and eight times more likely to get leukemia, and I do have the cite for that study.</p> <p>We know that each ten microgram per cubic meter of elevation in fine-particulate air pollution leads to an 8 percent increased risk of lung cancer, a 6 percent increased risk of cardiopulmonary mortality, and a 4 percent increased risk of death from general causes. And I can also provide the cite for that study.</p> <p>We know that a study in Erie County, New York, excluding the city of Buffalo, found that children living in neighborhoods with heavy truck traffic within 250 yards of their homes had increased risks of asthma hospitalization. I can provide that study as well.</p> <p>Given the existence and implications of this data, we request that CDOT, FHWA, the EPA, and CDPHE establish and disclose the levels of exposure that currently exists for our residents, the level of exposure that's likely to exist during the 15 years of construction, and the levels of the exposure that will likely exist in 2025.</p> <p>We request an analysis of the likely health effects due to those levels of exposure, and we request a discussion of the balancing that CDOT and FHWA will do to take into account these exposures and health effects when those agencies choose a preferred alternative from this study. It doesn't appear that the health issues of the children or the senior citizens or the public in general have played any role in making that decision to date.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
Categorized Comment	230	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Associations & Special Interest Groups	1/26/2005	<p>I'm Jo Ann Sorensen. I reside in Dumont, Colorado, in Clear Creek County. I'm a retired county commissioner and a member of the Clear Creek County I-70 Task Force. We are a group of volunteers who are reviewing the draft PEIS in order to submit comments. We have not yet completed our review, so we are appreciative of the extension for the public comment period that was announced.</p> <p>We do, however, have some preliminary comments to share, if I may, with the neighboring communities and with CDOT and the Federal Highway Administration. The areas of concern that I'd like to comment on are construction impacts and proposed mitigation policies for the impacts.</p> <p>We know that these impacts will be huge, not only to Clear Creek County, but also in the neighboring communities who rely on business, tourism, and personal-purpose traffic that must move through Clear Creek County. CDOT and FHWA have identified the dual-mode bus, or the diesel bus in a guideway, widening to six lanes, and reversible HOT and HOV lanes as the preferred group of alternatives. They were selected on basis of the cost and technical feasibility.</p> <p>Although the impacts these alternatives will have were disclosed in a broad-brush fashion, we don't believe these impacts are clearly analyzed for the public, nor does it appear that the impact analysis played a role in the selection of the preferred alternatives.</p> <p>In addition, the costs of mitigating those impacts are not adequately disclosed. A simple percentage of construction cost doesn't sufficiently address the issues that will likely be encountered.</p> <p>Although the data is sometimes difficult to understand, at this stage it appears to us that all of CDOT's preferred alternatives have the greatest construction impacts in terms of time, 15 years, of the greatest likelihood of releasing hazardous waste in terms of 23 mill sites where chemicals like arsenic and cadmium -- the greatest likelihood of environmental impacts in terms of water quality impacts, air quality impacts, and wildlife impacts, the greatest impacts on 106 and 4(f) for county resources like the Georgetown-Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District.</p> <p>Mitigations are not clearly identified, but when they're mentioned, they seem to be qualified by the concept of affordability. CDOT will end up doing what is affordable.</p> <p>As members of the public, we desire a much more descriptive section of the impacts of all of the alternatives and the mitigations that would likely be required both during construction and the impacts that would be experienced at the end.</p> <p>The economic impact discussion should lay out clearly to the average member of the public the impacts that not only the region will experience, but also the individual community, and we desire a better understanding of the financial aspects of both cost and of mitigation.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts

Categorized Comment	146	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Gary Register donated his time to her stating: "My points have been covered. I'd like to pass my time to Jo Ann Sorensen."</p> <p>Thank for sharing your time with me, Gary. I would just like to follow up. I think it's a good time because people have been commenting on the REMI model for the socioeconomic section of this study. And I would like to bring your attention to a few points I had time to uncover as I took some time to review this document. The conclusion in this study seems to be driven by traffic demand and by the economics of the region of the state.</p> <p>And I would like to point out there are some folks who are digging into the traffic demand model; that's something beyond my understanding. But I did look at some of the socioeconomic section. It appears that economic information from nine counties has been used in the preparation of the conclusion for this draft, and one of the nine counties is Park County.</p> <p>When I served as a member of the Mountain Corridor Advisory Committee, the inclusion of Park County was questioned because they aren't on I-70; they are served by 285. And when you look at their specific data, it shows that their growth, which so much of this project is designed to accommodate this growth in the mountain areas, their growth projections were given at 286 percent between 2000 and 2025.</p> <p>Other counties actually on the corridor have projections more in the 80 percent range. So we have an outlier out there that maybe has a huge influence on what we see as the demand and the need. And it doesn't seem to make sense for having that outlier included in the study. And then the final point that I wanted to make is we have a -- the fact that the economic analysis, the REMI model, aggregated all the information for nine counties. We think that it's important to disaggregate that information and to show county by county the economic information. I have a suspicion, and, of course, I have no way of proving it right now, that an action that may have great benefit to one location on this corridor could be devastating to another location.</p> <p>And although social justice is not a consideration that FHWA and CDOT have put forward, we believe in Clear Creek County that is a consideration. That the impacts that may be devastating to one location, possibly Clear Creek County, needs to be taken into consideration with a great benefit that perhaps some of the resort counties at the other end of the corridor would be getting.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	54	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	1/18/2005	<p>Comment period</p> <p>This study is over 1300 pages long in a large page format (11"x17"). In ordinary size paper that would be 2600 pages. Given that the study was released right before the holidays, we lost 20+ days. This is complex information that deserves thorough study. Please extend the comment period to at least 180 days.</p> <p>Jo Ann Sorensen joann@advdentek.com</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	110	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Associations & Special Interest Groups	1/19/2005	<p>I'm JoAnn Sorensen, I live in Dumont, Colorado. I am a recently retired Clear Creek County Commissioner, we're at the other end of this corridor. I am also representing the I-70 Task Force from Clear Creek County.</p> <p>We have been studying this as commissioners since the major investment study was initiated almost eight years ago. As an I-70 Task Force, our group has been studying these issues for 17 years, and we have concerns about many of the pieces of information that are being presented about the study here.</p> <p>One that I would like to share with our neighbors at the west end of this corridor, I think, is a common concern between the two of us.</p> <p>It refers to the fact that CDOT's preferred alternatives will take 15 years to build out, and a 15-year construction period is projected to begin in the year 2010. So that means for 20 years, from today until the 15-year construction period ends, we will be involved with difficulties and delays in traveling the I-70 corridor.</p> <p>For Clear Creek County, of course that means a whole lot, because we have to live with it. However, for people at the western end of the corridor, I think it may have some economic impacts that ought to be examined.</p> <p>The delays that will be created and the losses that will be created for our local businesses will be significant. I'm not sure that they're adequately discussed in the study.</p> <p>The impacts to the entire State of Colorado for 20 years of construction and congestion are not adequately analyzed in the document.</p> <p>Effects of 15 years of construction for the traveling public haven't been adequately disclosed and analyzed. For most of us in this room, our experience will be all pain and no gain, because this indicates -- this study indicates that by the year 2025 we will have the same state of congestion that we have today, which is a highway alternative.</p> <p>And my last point is that the study does not clearly disclose the methods that will be used to finance the construction of the preferred alternative. The study talks about CDOT expecting to have \$1.6 billion identified over the next 20 years, but that includes tolls and increased taxes.</p> <p>Are we to infer that we have to pay tolls during the construction period?</p> <p>Not only will travelers be driving a torn up, dangerous and unhealthy highway, they could also have to pay as much as 35 cents a mile to do so through Clear Creek County.</p> <p>These are flaws in the study that our I-70 Task Force has identified, and we have other concerns as well.</p> <p>We believe that the study should cause -- that these flaws should cause CDOT and FHWA to reconsider the categories of preferred and not preferred alternatives.</p> <p>We think this document needs to be withdrawn, re-worked, and released when complete and accurate data and analyses can be presented to the public.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	168	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	1/15/2005	<p>I'm Jo Ann Sorensen from Dumont, Colorado, 22 Mill Creek Road. I'm a former county commissioner in Clear Creek County, and so we have been watching this study for years now.</p> <p>I'd like to offer, first of all, a request to extend the comment period. This is a massive document that you have out in the hallway. It's over 1,300 pages, 11-by-17 in size, so in standard document size that would be over 2,600 pages. It was released on December 10, and not too many of us had the chance to look at it over the holidays. I've had about two weeks to look at some critical areas. So I would urge an extension of the comment period to 180 days.</p> <p>The second thing I'd like to comment on is I think the public awareness that CDOT's preferred alternatives will take 15 years to build is something that ought to be thoroughly examined and discussed. The 15-year construction period, which is projected to begin in 2010, means that, first, we have five more years of the issues we are facing today. And then we have 15 years of a very difficult construction period.</p> <p>The impacts to the economy of the I-70 corridor and to the state of Colorado for 20 years of this kind of congestion are not adequately analyzed in the document. The effects of 15 years of construction from the traveling public have not been adequately disclosed and analyzed in this document. For most of us in this room, it's been noted that it will be all pain and no gain, because this study indicates that by the year 2025 we will have the same state of congestion that we have today.</p> <p>Another area that I'd like to comment on is the capital costs. The capital costs of the preferred alternatives range from 2.4 billion to 3.8 billion, and this study does not clearly disclose the source of funding for these preferred alternatives. It talks about CDOT expecting to have 1.6 billion dollars identified over the next 20 years, but that includes tolls and increased taxes. Are we to infer that we will have to pay tolls during the construction period? Not only will travelers be put through the misery of driving through a torn-up, dangerous, and unhealthy highway, could they also have to pay as much as 35 cents a mile to do so?</p> <p>I think these are flaws in the study that should cause CDOT and FHWA to reconsider the categories of preferred and not preferred. This document ought to be withdrawn and reworked and released when complete and accurate data and analyses can be presented to the public.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	416	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	2/26/2005	<p>Thanks for the opportunity to speak once again. I'm Jo Ann Sorensen. I live in Clear Creek County. I am a former county commissioner there, and I have been participating in this study as well as the gaming access study for the last several years.</p>	Transcripts

I wanted to clarify, yes, I was interviewed yesterday by 9 News, and I did make that statement about 20 years of construction in the I-70 corridor. And maybe I'm misinterpreting some of the information that I understood from the charts, but one of the no-action items -- no action doesn't mean that nothing's going to happen in the I-70 corridor -- one of the no-action items is the gaming access action.

And although that group hasn't met -- or at least I haven't been notified of any meetings for months -- I know that one of the very strong contenders for an action is a tunnel that will connect I-70 to I-19. And the plans that we saw for that tunnel connect to I-70 by doing a great deal of work from Kermits, if those of you who drive I-70 are familiar, all the way to the top of Floyd Hill.

I'm assuming that that still is an option, and as soon as that EIS is done, some action will be taken. And if you guys have taken that off the table, then tell us there's nothing that's going to happen constructionwise on I-70. I will retract that statement about 20 years of inconvenience. But I believe that's still on the table. And I think as a reasonable scenario we should expect that there will be a cone zone on I-70 for 20 years.

The other thing I'd like to comment on is I'm really pleased to see the number of young people in the room today. This is the first hearing I've been at where we have had that kind of interest. And I'd like to mention something that I think is relevant for the young people who are in the room. And that is how this project will be paid for regardless whether it's a highway or a transit system, whatever.

If you get the opportunity to look at the document, Chapter 5 talks about how financing would occur. CDOT has identified \$1.3 billion as reasonably available through their funding program called the Seventh Pot. That's 1.3 billion. None of the alternatives that are being considered are in that cost range. They all exceed that.

They have identified that there may be additional monies besides monies CDOT can raise. FHWA might contribute, FAA, the Federal Aviation, and FTA, Federal Transit, could contribute as much as \$50 million. They believe that there would be tolling that could contribute 300 million -- no, 250 million. Then undefined innovative sources could probably provide 300 million. That gets us to 2.2 billion. And if you look at the chart, there really isn't much of anything that will be accomplished for the 2.2 billion, at least nothing that CDOT believes will meet the need.

Even if you accept that 2.2 billion might be enough to do something, you've got people in the room who will be taxpayers not all that far down the road. These innovative sources for their funding means increases in taxes on a motor vehicle; it means possibly a vehicle miles-traveled tax. That means you take your car to a center to have them check your odometer every year and pay a tax for having driven your vehicle.

It means possibly a visitor benefit tax. And many people would say that's fair, you know, people who visit should help pay for the transportation system. It may mean a real estate transfer tax. If you become a homeowner sometime in the next 20 years, you may be subject to that extra tax. It may mean a recreation use surcharge, which is another name for a tax. It means that if you guys who are enjoying recreation today are willing to pay a little more for the transportation system, great, that's probably a good civic answer to have.

But I would like to point out that even with all those innovative sources, we don't have enough to accomplish even CDOT's preferred alternative, much less the preferred alternative of the folks from Clear Creek who say let's build a transit system that can really address the capacity issue.

If we're going to be having to subject ourselves to tolls and taxes, shouldn't we build a system that will really meet the need? Let's just go and make that giant step, make the commitment and do a system that will serve the need for future generations. You guys are going to be the ones who will be enjoying it. By the time 20 years has passed, I'm probably going to be content to sit on my porch in a rocking chair. But you guys are the ones who are going to enjoy it.

Categorized Comment	322	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	2/12/2005	<p>I'm Joann Sorensen. I'm a former commissioner from Clear Creek County, and I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak one more time on this issue.</p> <p>I made the trip over today because I wanted to express the understanding that I have about the community here in Glenwood Springs, about how they became very concerned when the decision was finally made to route I-70 through Glenwood Canyon, and how they came together and really as a community made their voices heard to come up with a solution that they believed their community here could live with.</p> <p>And I'm asking them to kind of look at it from the perspective that we have in Clear Creek County, because 90 percent of the construction that is proposed for this project will occur in the county that I live in. And we have some assets that we also value very highly. We have a national historic landmark district, Georgetown and Silver Plume. We have a national historic district in Idaho Springs. And we have individual historic sites, all of which would be impacted with any of the preferred alternatives that are being recommended through this study.</p> <p>So I really am pleased that the coalition is working so hard to come up with a solution that will be acceptable throughout the region. And I want to thank you for that effort. And I would hope that people who might not be directly involved in that coalition would also keep in mind some of those assets that we all want to protect and value, not only for our local community, but for the state and for this country. Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	303	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	2/9/2005	<p>I'd like to thank Nancy for bringing up the health issues, because that was indeed an issue that I kind of honed in on earlier, and I'd like to provide more details on that. When we saw the quick slide this evening about the tradeoff analysis that would take place, I don't remember if it included environmental and health tradeoff discussions, but I think it ought to.</p> <p>I'd like to talk a little bit about Volume I, Section 3.1 in the draft PEIS, specifically about the air quality discussion in Clear Creek County. Tables 3.1-2 indicate that while CDOT and FHWA are operating with actual data from Garfield, Eagle, Summit and Jefferson Counties, there's no clear empirical data referenced on that chart for Clear Creek County. As the residents of Clear Creek County, which is expected to experience 90 percent of the construction for this corridor for 15 years, I find the lack of actual data to be a serious flaw.</p> <p>In addition, the discussions on page 3.1-6 to 3.1-8 appear to focus on conditions in the year 2025. There's no discussion to quantify the impacts during the 15-year construction period.</p> <p>Specifically in Clear Creek County, we're concerned about the effects of automobile and truck emission that would be concentrated in our communities, not only in the year 2025, but also during those 15 years of construction, the years when I-70 traffic will likely be diverted to our community streets and our neighborhood, when as many as 50,000 vehicles per day, according to Volume II, Chart B-9, could be contaminating the air by our Carlson Elementary School in Idaho Springs and through our residential areas in Idaho Springs, Dumont, Lawson, and Downieville, and Silver Plume, areas where we know there are concentrations of low-income residents.</p> <p>We request a more understandable disclosure of the amount of traffic that will be diverted past our school and through our residential areas. We request disclosure of the anticipated health effects. We know that a 2000 -- a year 2000 average study showed that children living within 250 yards of streets or highways with 20,000 vehicles per day are six times more likely to develop all types of cancer and eight times more likely to get leukemia.</p> <p>We know that each 10 microgram per cubic meter elevation in fine particulate air pollution leads to an 8 percent increased risk of lung cancer deaths, a 6 percent increased risk of cardiopulmonary mortality, and a 4 percent increased risk of death from general causes. We know that a study in Erie County, New York, which excludes the city of Buffalo, found that children living in neighborhoods with heavy truck traffic within 250 yards of their homes had increased risks of asthma hospitalization.</p> <p>Given the existence and implications of this data, we request that CDOT, FHWA, the EPA and CDPHE establish and disclose the levels of exposure that presently exist to our residents, the levels of exposure that will likely exist during the 15 years of construction, and the levels of exposure that will likely exist in 2025.</p> <p>We request the analysis of the likely health effects due to those exposures. And we request a discussion of the balancing that CDOT and FHWA will do when they take into account the exposures and the health effects when those agencies choose a preferred alternative in this PEIS. It doesn't appear that the health issues for children, for our senior citizens, and the public in general have played any role in the decision being made.</p> <p>That's all I have to say except I would like to encourage you not to make Clear Creek County your sacrifice zone. Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	545	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	5/23/2005	<p>It is difficult for members of the public to evaluate the alternatives displayed in this document when it is not complete within itself. For example numerous documents are referenced, but not found, in the document. The list includes, but may not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Access to Gaming EIS</li> <li>The ALIVE reports for the I-70 PEIS</li> <li>The SWEET reports for the I-70 PEIS</li> <li>The Programmatic Agreement for the Section 106 properties</li> <li>Any all agreements between the US Army Corps of Engineers, FHWA and CDOT relating the I-70 PEIS</li> <li>Minutes of MCAC meetings</li> </ul>	Online

Further, the document refers to input from the Mountain Corridor Advisory Committee but does not document the issues raised by the group, the response to the issues, and the role that the advice of the group played in the selection of the alternatives or preparation of the documents. As a member of the MCAC I found the experience to be incomplete and unsatisfactory. It was not an interactive process. The count of meetings is not reflective of the quality of the communications. It was very much a matter of show and tell vs a process reflective inclusion and resolution of local concerns.

Please make all of these reports, agreements and documents available before the release of the Final PEIS. Make them available with a reasonable time for comment and review – 30 days would be too short.

Categorized Comment	369	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Good evening. Thanks for the opportunity to speak once again. I am Jo Ann Sorensen. I live in Dumont, Colorado. I'm a former Clear Creek County commissioner, and I am presently working with the Clear Creek County I-70 task force, which is one of the groups that have studied this issue for the last 17 years.</p> <p>I really don't have anything to add to all the comments that we've heard this evening. I think they have summed up the concerns that the I-70 task force had. I would just like to expand on one that has been mentioned before, and I would like to really request that this I-70 expansion include the health effects.</p> <p>We know that the -- the incidents of cancer, of respiratory arrest, all of those illnesses that are of concern in the public health arena here in the state of Colorado are indeed related to emissions from automobiles and trucks. And we have numbers of studies, some of them done right here in Colorado. None of them were mentioned in this document. Health has not even played a role yet.</p> <p>I think this study needs to be revised and deal with the health issues. I have documents that I'd like to submit to the court reporter.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	387	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	2/23/2005	<p>I'm Jo Ann Sorensen, a Clear Creek County resident and a former Clear Creek County commissioner and presently working on the I-70 task force in Clear Creek County.</p> <p>I'd like to enter into the record comments on the plan for financing any of the alternatives that are in the draft. We know that \$4 billion has been accepted as the reasonable cost kept for this project. However, in reviewing the information presented in Chapter 5, it appears that \$1.6 billion is the amount of money reasonably expected in CDOT's "seventh pot" over the next 20 years. That seems to be the only solid source of funding that has been identified. That amount would fund the minimal action improvements, estimated to cost 1.3 billion.</p> <p>As described on page 5-11, FHWA, FAA, and FTA might provide as much as \$50 million, tolling could add 250 million, and undefined innovative sources could provide 300 million. This brings us to an optimistic total, using CDOT's own term that's on page 5-11, of 2.2 billion.</p> <p>Referring to the chart on page 5-8, this is not enough to construct any of CDOT's preferred alternatives. This fact is somewhat buried in the document. I believe it needs to be stated in a much more straightforward fashion. Other disclosures that ought to be made in a more straightforward fashion are the tolling options and the undefined innovative sources description.</p> <p>Regarding tolling, since the time period covered by this study is the next 20 years, does the \$250 million mentioned on page 5-11 reflect tolling the existing facility now, during construction, and then after completion of any improvements? Will all of us who live, work, or recreate in the corridor have to pay a toll to travel even if the highway is strangled by construction-induced congestion?</p> <p>Regarding the undefined innovative sources, Charts 5-4, 5-5, and they appear on page 5-10, list the following possibilities: Statewide, a transportation excise tax, removal of selected exemptions of state sales tax, a vehicle miles traveled tax. For communities within the corridor, the possibilities are a one quarter percent sales tax increase, an increase in motor vehicle registration fees, and a one half percent visitor benefit tax, a real estate transfer tax, a recreation use surcharge.</p> <p>Does the public actually understand that if they support anything more than CDOT's minimal action alternative, they will have to authorize the kinds of fees, taxes, and tolls that I just listed? Does the public understand that once those fees, taxes, and tolls are put in place the amount of money generated over the next 20 years will pay for little more than minimal action? To build anything more than the minimal improvements, any general widening, any transit, or any combination of those two, there's still at least \$300 million as a shortfall based on Chapter 5. If I am misstating facts, please take that as further evidence of the inadequacy of the document.</p> <p>Chapter 5 is critical to an informed decision on the project. I have spent hours pouring over the draft. I consider myself to be at least average as a member of the public. I don't understand this piece of the document, and I would suggest that the facts need to be presented in a clearer format.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	807	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	2/2/2005	<p>PEIS Comments 2/2/05</p> <p>Jo Ann Sorensen 220 Mill Creek Rd. Dumont, CO</p> <p>I am making comments on Volume 1, Section 3.1, Draft PEIS. Specifically I have concerns about the Air Quality discussion for Clear Creek County.</p> <p>Table 3.1-2 indicates that while CDOT and FHWA are operating with actual data for Garfield, Eagle, Summit and Jefferson counties, there is no empirical data for Clear Creek County. As a resident of the Clear Creek County, which is expected to experience 90% of the construction for this corridor for 15 years, I find the lack of actual data to be a serious flaw.</p> <p>In addition, the discussions on pages 3.1-6 through 3.1-8 appear to focus on conditions in the year 2025. There is no discussion of quantifiable impacts during the 15-year construction period. Specifically, in Clear Creek County we are concerned about the effects of automobile and truck emissions that will be concentrated in our communities not only in the year 2025, but also during the 15 years of construction -- the years when the I-70 traffic will be diverted to our community streets and our neighborhoods. When as many as 50,000 vehicles per day (Vol 2, Chart B-9) could be contaminating the air by our Carlson Elementary School in Ikhao Springs and through our residential areas in Ikhao Springs, Dumont, Lawson, Downieville and Silver Plume -- areas where we know there are concentrations of low-income residents.</p> <p>We request a more understandable disclosure of the amount of daily traffic that will be diverted past our school and through our residential areas. We request disclosure of the anticipated health effects.</p> <p>We know that a 2000 Denver study showed that children living within 250 yards of streets or highways with 20,000 vehicles per day are 6 times more likely to develop all types of cancer and 8 times more likely to get leukemia. [Parson, Wachtel; Robert L. Pearson and Kristie Ebie (2000) in the Journal of Air and Waste Management Association 50:175-180]</p> <p>We know that each 10 microgram/cubic meter elevation in fine particulate air pollution leads to an 8 percent increased risk of lung cancer deaths, a 6 percent increased risk of cardiopulmonary mortality and a 4 percent increased risk of death from general causes. (Pope, Clive Arden II; Richard P Burnett, et al. Lung Cancer, Cardiopulmonary Mortality, and Long Term Exposure to Fine Particulate Air Pollution. Journal of the American Medical Association, March 6 2002 Vol 287, No. 92)</p> <p>We know that a study in Erie County, New York (excluding the city of Buffalo) found that children living in neighborhoods with heavy truck traffic within 250 yards of their homes had increased risks of asthma hospitalization. (Lin, Shao; Jean Pierre; Jean Pierre Munsie; Syni-An Hwang; Edward Fitzgerald; and Michael R. Cayo, (2002). Childhood Asthma Hospitalization and Residential Exposure to StateRoute Traffic. Environmental Research, Section A, Vol. 88, pp. 73-8 1.)</p> <p>Given the existence and implications of this data, we request that CDOT, FHWA, the EPA and CDPHE establish and disclose the levels of exposure that presently exist for our residents, the levels of exposure that will likely exist during the 15 years of construction, and the levels of exposure that will likely exist in 2025. We request an analysis of the likely health effects due to those levels of exposure.</p> <p>And we request a discussion of the balancing that CDOT and FHWA will do to take into account these exposures and health effects when those agencies choose a preferred alternative in this PEIS.</p> <p>It doesn't appear that the health issues for children, for our senior citizens, and for the public in general, have played any role in the decision-making to date.</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
Categorized Comment	808	Sorensen, Jo Ann	Public	2/23/2005	<p>February 23, 2005</p> <p>Draft PEIS Public Hearing</p> <p>Comments</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments



Jo Ann Sorensen  
PO Box 378  
Durmont, CO 80436

I would like to enter into the record comments on the plan for financing any of the alternatives in the Draft. In reviewing the information presented in Chapter 5, it appears that \$1.6 billion is the amount of money reasonably expected in CDOT's 7th pot over the next 20 years. That seems to be the only solid source of funding that has been identified. That amount could fund the Minimal Action Improvements, estimated to cost \$1.3 billion.

As described in Table 5-3 on page 5-11, FHWA, FAA and FTA might provide as much as \$50 million. Tolling could add \$250 million, and undefined innovative sources could provide \$300 million. This brings us to an optimistic total (using CDOT's own term on page 5-11) of \$2.2 billion. Referring to the chart on page 5-8 of the Draft, this is not enough to construct any of CDOT's preferred alternatives. This fact is somewhat buried in the document. I believe it needs to be stated in a much more straightforward fashion.

Other disclosures that ought to be made in a more straightforward fashion are the tolling options and the "undefined innovative sources."

Regarding tolling:

Since the time period covered by this study is the next twenty years, does the \$250 million mentioned on page 5-11 reflect tolling the existing facility, now, during construction, and after completion of any improvements? Will all of us who live, work or recreate in this corridor have to pay a toll to travel it even if it is strangled by construction-induced congestion?

Regarding the "undefined innovative sources.":

Charts 5.4 and 5.5, page 5-10, list the following possibilities: Statewide - a transportation excise tax, removal of selected exemptions to state sales tax, a vehicle miles traveled tax. For communities within the corridor, the possibilities are: a 1/4% sales tax increase, an increase in Motor Vehicle Registration Fees, a 1/2% Visitor Benefit Tax, a Real Estate Transfer Tax, a Recreation Use Surcharge.

Does the public actually understand that if they support anything more than CDOT's minimal action alternative, they will have to authorize the kinds of fees, taxes and tolls that I just listed? Does the public understand that once those fees, taxes and tolls are put in place, the amount of money generated over the next 20 years will pay for little more than minimal action? To build anything more than minimal improvements (any general widening, transit or a combination) there is still a \$300 million shortfall for the cheapest of the 6 lane alternatives.

If I am mis-stating the facts, please take that as further evidence of the inadequacy of the document. Chapter 5 is critical to an informed decision on this project. I have spent hours poring over the Draft. I consider myself to be an at least "average" member of the public. If I don't understand this piece of the document, I would suggest that the facts need to be presented in a clearer format.

Categorized Comment	280	Spears, Steven	Public	3/6/2005	<p>I am concerned that there is not enough emphasis on alternative transportation. Designing to the "automobile" is so far behind the times in modern and future technology trends of transportation.</p> <p>PLEASE consider the benefits of alternative transportation (rail and monorail especially). It is the best thing for the long term of I-70. Designing to an automobile only level is not the best thing for our fragile mountain environment in the long term.</p> <p>Also, please extend the alternative transportation into Glenwood Springs. If you would use rail, this would work well as there is an active train station in downtown. This is excellent for economic development (sales tax).</p> <p>Finally, please understand that I-70 is a major east/west corridor across the country. Any way that commuting automobile traffic from urban center to resort (Front Range to the mountains) can be reduced so that longer distance traffic across the country can flow easier.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Steven Spears</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	219	Spletzer, Nancy	Public	2/9/2005	<p>1. You are highway builders and do a good job but don't expand I-70. We will be wall to wall concrete. The aesthetics of Colorado will be lost. Already trees along the highway are dieing and view are being swallowed in cement.</p> <p>2. However, things you could do:</p> <p>a. Complete the frontage road to at least Empire Junction. This will help with traffic backups and delays.</p> <p>b. Improve other highways throughout the state. I-70 should not be the only multilane access to the mountains. People who come from south and north should have access from those areas.</p> <p>c. DO NOT allow semitrucks to pass. They must stay in the right lane. In NC and SC this is the rule and traffic flows much more smoothly in those states. A truck going 27 mph passing a truck going 25 mph really causes a backup of traffic.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	316	Spletzer, Nancy	Public	2/9/2005	<p>I had a lot of things written out, and all of you have expressed my ideas and more and extremely articulately. I really want to thank you.</p> <p>I really would like to say the 19th century is going to be remembered for horse travel, the 20th century is going to be remembered for automobile travel. And I know a lot of us probably jumped in the cars with our families to travel across the continent for vacations. Please do not let the 21st century be remembered for automobile travel.</p> <p>Our communities are increasing in population and for reasons mentioned by everyone in here, environmental safety, just the whole thing, by the time the highway's built, we're going to have the same problem. I implore you to be progressive. You owe it to the people of this state and the people of this country to think progressively and not just build more cement.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	524	Spencer, Scott	Public	5/20/2005	<p>Scott S.</p> <p>Persuasive Essay Paper</p> <p>This paper is about the I-70 corridor and some other solutions on I-70 so that the highway isn't as packed in 25 years. It also has some of my opinions and disagreements. I believe that the AGS is the best because it doesn't cause as much pollution. It also doesn't disturb any land besides the land that has been disturbed. It also doesn't make that much noise and wont wake people in their houses. First I will talk about the expansion of the road. Their plan to expand the road is so that there is less traffic. But if they expand it then they might have to kick some people out of their houses. Another thing is that the pollution of Colorado will probably triple. If you go into the mountains you can see how bad our pollution is and if we add more it can give you asthma. Some people say that we will run out of oil in about 20 years. It sickens me of how we will kill the earth just for faster travel and entertainment. The bus system sounds ok to some people. What they don't know is if we do that it will be worse than the 6 lane highway because diesel fuel is twice as bad as regular unleaded. The last thing is that the high tech mechanical arms can default and land you in a crash. That is why I think that the AGS will be the best. Although CDOT thinks they have enough info that their stuff would not matter if they pollute something. I believe that cdot cares more about business more than the welfare of the planet. In conclusion that is why I disagree with cdots plans. And yet I am still sticking with the AGS system. To end this paper I think cdot should change to someone else's point of view.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	525	Spencer, Scott	Public	5/20/2005	<p>Scott S.</p> <p>Persuasive Essay Paper</p> <p>This paper is about the I-70 corridor and some other solutions on I-70 so that the highway isn't as packed in 25 years. It also has some of my opinions and disagreements. I believe that the AGS is the best because it doesn't cause as much pollution. It also doesn't disturb any land besides the land that has been disturbed. It also doesn't make that much noise and wont wake people in their houses. First I will talk about the expansion of the road. Their plan to expand the road is so that there is less traffic. But if they expand it then they might have to kick some people out of their houses. Another thing is that the pollution of Colorado will probably triple. If you go into the mountains you can see how bad our pollution is and if we add more it can give you asthma. Some people say that we</p>	Online

Categorized Comment	424	Spielberg, Greg T.	Public	3/31/2005	<p>To Whom This May Concern,</p> <p>I certainly appreciate the fact that you're taking into serious consideration the logistics of improving traffic and travelability on I-70. There have been many recommendations by every party here in the Valley. However, I see most of them as either unrealistic or impractical. Any expansion of the road would take a tremendous amount of work as well as increased funding for police, plowing, and potentially, ambulatory services. Toll boths are essentially an impossibility because traffic would be out of control, especially in winter weather.</p> <p>All over the world, communities and regions rely on train service to alleviate traffic and increase accessibility. I feel this would be the perfect solution to the I-70 problems. The tracks would barely take up any space (in comparison to extra lanes), and it seems there would be an already decent path for it to go as all the original towns around here are mining towns anywhere.</p> <p>Railways would not only help a spacial problem (in these very vertical mountains), they would also cut down drastically on the amount of exhaust as well as the gas consumption in the region.</p> <p>Who wouldn't want to take a train? Weekend and day-trippers would gladly skip traffic, attention to driving, parking and all the rest that it takes to get here from Denver and elsewhere. You wouldn't have tired boarders and skiers driving at 6 a.m. or 4 p.m. wiped out from the night before or a full day of skiing.</p> <p>Youth would also be served well because they can't drive. Any 14, 15, 16 year-old could hop on the train and ride to Vail/Beaver Creek for the day or weekend. Europe and the east coast has utilized this system for years. I'm from Long Island and would have never gotten a taste for New York City had it not been for the LIRR.</p> <p>Finally, an increase in traffic volume would inevitably necessitate an increase in lanes and paved roadways. A rail system would only need more trains.</p> <p>Sincerely, Greg T. Spielberg Copy Editor, Vail Daily</p> <p>P.S. I would love to be an involved part of the conversation process and feel that this by far is the best solution to the travel problem.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	170	Spies, Michael	Municipalities	1/15/2005	<p>I'm Michael Spies of Empire, Colorado. I'm hesitant to give my street address. I made comments Wednesday night at the meeting, and Thursday I saw a CDOT truck driving down Highway 40 with a howitzer. I'm hoping it's just for snow removal, but I'm still hesitant to be too critical here.</p> <p>I am on the town board of Empire. And I'm only going to make one comment as a member of the board. The rest are my personal comments. And that is, again, a request for the extension of the hearing -- of the public input process and an additional hearing process when things have been -- before -- after this has been finalized but before we move on to the Tier II position, because I want to be able to comment on whatever the revisions are as well in this document.</p> <p>On a personal note, I think this document severely underestimates or fails to consider the economic impact during the construction process. Everybody talks about, Well, it's going to start in five years and it's going to last 15 years. Those numbers don't sound like much until you put them in perspective.</p> <p>I have no kids. If I decided to have a child, I am fairly confident the trip to the delivery room would not be through the construction zone. I am also very confident that when I take them to kindergarten for the very first time I'll be driving through construction. When they learn to drive, they will learn to drive in construction. When I go to their high school graduation, I will drive through construction to get to the high school graduation. The good news is, should they happen to graduate from college, I will probably not have to drive through the widening construction on the way to the graduation from college.</p> <p>This is a huge impact time-wise and lifestyle-wise for a major portion of people's lives. I don't believe the economic impact has considered the number of people that will decide that they need to leave the county because they don't want to put up with that for the entire childhood of their kids. People are not going to buy second homes up there because they don't -- they will have bought and sold two or three homes in the length of time it takes for that work to get done.</p> <p>So I think we need to seriously look at the economic impacts during construction. I don't think that's been adequately addressed at all. This is just one of many points I have to make, and I'll be at other public hearings. I do want to make a couple of other -- before I run out of time.</p> <p>First and foremost, I am objecting to this hearing process. Because I was at the one in Clear Creek; we had 46 commenters and I was given three minutes. I was told in the interest of time here, with only 18 people signed up, we're also limited to three minutes apiece and that we cannot allocate time to those people who are more expert and the people who don't work for CDOT. This is an attempt to stifle public input, not encourage public input. So I am objecting to the very process.</p> <p>One last comment. We were told by Mr. Norton that they would work on controlling access and mobility through the construction process. "We've got experience with T-Rex and with Berthoud Pass; trust us on this." I drove Berthoud Pass during construction because I worked in Grand County. I don't trust their opinion of what open mobility is.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	153	Spies, Michael	Municipalities	1/12/2005	<p>Michael Spies. I'm actually here representing the Town of Empire, and I'll have a few highlights of personals also, other than those expressed by the town board of Empire.</p> <p>The first and foremost is the town board of Empire is -- we're very concerned about the length of the comment period and receiving the PEIS. It is far in excess, both in word count and weight, of any college textbook I've ever seen, and we've been given far less than a semester in which to study it and no professor to help us out. So I'm going to need a little extra time to digest this one.</p> <p>Be aware that we're talking about a construction period here that will not be over until 20 percent of the people in this county have already died. Please, given the magnitude of this, give us some time to look at it. It is going to impact a lot of us for the entire rest of our lives just in the construction phase. And we need to make sure that we are analyzing all the viable alternatives and analyzing them properly.</p> <p>We're also concerned about the economic impacts, as every town here is. Everything I've looked at, even the minimal impact, is talking about metering traffic flow from Highway 40 onto I-70. Living in Empire, this means I now get to live in a parking lot because I-70's going to be backed up all the way to Berthoud Falls when that happens.</p> <p>Several of the restaurants can have street vendors out there and can do pretty well selling to people in stopped traffic. But there's been no attempt at talking about how to mitigate the impacts on our community with that and bigger impacts to other communities. That's all put off to Tier II, Tier II, we've already eliminated the other alternatives. If there's no good way of mitigating it, we are stuck. So we need to evaluate that before we get to Tier II.</p> <p>On personal comments, I don't think we've really looked at economic impact of the construction period. Just an informal look around the town of Empire, most of the newer houses and most of the renovations of turn-of-the-century houses occurred back when I-70 went through and put in the tunnel.</p> <p>A large number of people, including the person who built my house, moved there for the construction process. We're going to have a lot of impact to our economics as construction workers move here [INAUDIBLE] our ability to handle them with our infrastructure to produce. So we need to take some very serious looks at what the construction process is going to mean to the town -- all the towns in the area.</p> <p>That's all I've got for the moment. I'll have a whole lot more after the extended period for comments and will provide some written comments as well. Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	482	Sprehn, Bobbi	Public	5/10/2005	<p>I'm disappointed in what I consider to be the short-sightedness of this draft. There seems to be no open discussion on other alternatives besides adding more concrete. Which, obviously won't be the answer in 15 years. I've never understood the monetary cap that was arbitrarily slapped on this project. There are numerous ways to pay for alternatives if the alternative was a more popular choice for DOT, as in a monorail type system. Couldn't it be a commercial venture, hauling people and goods? Mocha or cappachino anyone?</p> <p>Clear Creek County stands to lose the most, with no benefit than I can see. Many of us don't have the 15 years of aggravation to wait it out. Not to mention, the forced evacuations, businesses &amp; histories lost and the environmental impact, which from what I can tell, hasn't been sufficiently explored. Has 285 been looked into as an alternative? In my opinion, I can only see pain and no gain.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	28	Sproh, John	Public	1/11/2005	<p>Widening of I-70 Corridor</p> <p>Personally our family supports the widening of the I-70 mountain corridor. Traffic to and from the mountains and Denver is horrific as you know in the summer and winter. I can only imagine the lost revenue (and taxes to the state) for businesses in Summit County given how little we used to make the trip just due to the horrible travel.</p> <p>Simply put the traffic flow is too much for the current 4 lane road. I do not believe rail is a viable option given the diversity of entry and exit points needed and # of seats needed. The time required would also hamper any rail "solution" effectiveness. So I would not vote for public funds in any rail "solution".</p> <p>So we are in favor of widening the road. I realize new taxes may be levied and I would hope that the businesses that should be helped (ski areas etc) would pitch in some as well. It would be in their self interest.</p>	Online

Thanks,

John Sprow

johnsprow@yahoo.com

Categorized Comment	381	Sramek, Rick	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/23/2005	<p>Hi. My name is Rick Sramek, and I'm here representing Breckenridge and Keystone resorts, and, quite honestly, myself as a 30-year resident of Summit County.</p> <p>And while we are participating with the I-70 coalition to hopefully come up with a regionally preferred alternative, we support CDOT in the enhancement of capacity on I-70 from the stretch from Floyd Hill through the tunnel and the preservation of mass transit when it becomes feasible in the future. And we also look forward to the successful conclusion of this process after seven years and moving forward with some positive action.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	637	Vail Resorts	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	<p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager CDOT Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Dear Cecelia and Jean,</p> <p>Please accept these comments regarding the I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS on behalf of Vail Resorts. We appreciate the extraordinary lengths to which CDOT has gone to enlist public input over an arduous 7 year process and look forward to moving on to begin Tier II design, and ultimately implementation of improvements to the I-70 corridor. After involvement in the I-70 process, examination of the draft, and our own experience via observation and guest feedback, we believe the Combination Alternative that provides for 6-lanes in the 47 mile section from Floyd Hill to E.J.M.T., and provides for preservation of space for transit best meets the stated purpose and need of the PEIS. Because of the year around nature of use in the corridor and the highly dispersed destinations of the users improvements to capacity of the roadway need to be the first priority of implementation. Also included in this phasing should be additional bores at the Twin Tunnels and E.J.M.T. The 47-mile section mentioned above is the pinch point that exists between two 6-lane sections and therefore is cause of the backups that now trouble the corridor. While transit may in the long run be an important part of the ultimate solution two major issues need more careful examination: 1. The ability of whatever system is chosen to operate reliably in the mountain environment. 2. The financial viability of a system in that it must be self sustaining and not require subsidy by the citizens of the State of Colorado.</p> <p>Finally the issue of expedience needs to be a part of the planning and implementation of the Corridor improvements. The procurement of funding and prioritization of its application need to be handled so that the time frame of improvements on this vital transportation corridor is not strung out over 15 -20 years but is accomplished in the next 6-10 years. While we know that CDOT is aware of the issue and importance of construction interruptions, it bears mentioning this must be dealt with as efficiently as possible to minimize the impacts to and vitality of local economies along the corridor.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Rick Sramek VP Resort Operations</p>	Email
Categorized Comment	185	Stahl, Sam	Public	2/14/2005	<p>Please widen I-70 to 4 or 5 lanes in each direction. A monorail will not be used by most skiers. We carry lots of equipment and do not want to be strapped to a monorail schedule and per-use costs.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	161	Stanley, Shelley	Municipalities	1/15/2005	<p>My name is Shelley Stanley. I'm the water resources coordinator for the City of Northglenn. The cities of Northglenn, Thornton, and Westminster get their water supply from Clear Creek. It's diverted into several reservoirs including Standley Lake. There's 300,000-plus people that get their water from Clear Creek, and this region is growing. So we have a tremendous concern about the water quality impacts that could occur during both the construction period and then the maintenance as well.</p> <p>Specifically, we have concerns about increase in sediment, phosphorous, and heavy metals. Now, these programs are a concern to us because they pose a public health threat by affecting our water resource. And then, potentially, we can have -- it could result in increased costs for us to treat our water for our citizens.</p> <p>Now, we understand that this was a Tier I review. We would have preferred to have more detail. We would have felt more comfortable with more detail in both making a selection. But, that said, we would appreciate it if CDOT would consider our following comments and concerns at the Tier II level.</p> <p>The mobilization and fate of heavy metals from 23 historic mining sites that will be disturbed during the construction period, the fate in transport of deicers will be evaluated. We need a strong commitment from CDOT regarding water quality mitigation measures, both during construction and postconstruction.</p> <p>Stormwater's a concern to us, and in all honesty, we would like to see permanent -- as it is a 15-year construction period, we would like to see permanent VMPs installed during the construction process.</p> <p>Lastly, we'd like to see the value of our natural resources, like water, air, and visual, be considered in the cost analysis. Water's a very expensive natural resource to purchase. The cities of Northglenn and Westminster also have a representative here who recognize that the I-70 corridor has to be upgraded. We would support installation of permanent VMBs during construction, minimize water quality impacts, as well as we would appreciate a commitment by CDOT for long-term water quality monitoring.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	468	Stark, Arlynn	Public	4/11/2005	<p>Arlynn Stark and James Mms</p> <p>1250 CLEAR CREEK RD EVERGREEN, CO 80439 phone 303-967-4735 fax 303-567-4740</p> <p>April 11, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager CDOT, Region 1 18500 E. Colfax Ave. Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>Jean Wallace, Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 W. Dakota Ave. Suite 180 Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>RE: CDOT'S PROPOSALS FOR I-70 CORRIDOR EXPANSION</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy and Ms. Wallace,</p> <p>We are writing to express our serious concerns with CDOT's proposals for expansion of the I-70 corridor, from the intersection of C470 to Glenwood Springs. Our concerns are as follows.</p> <p>1. Each of the 6 options being considered by CDOT will require approximately 15 years of construction. There currently are no viable alternate routes; nor does CDOT plan to create one to accommodate the major traffic congestion which will occur as people attempt to use the I-70 corridor during this long period of time. Many of the smaller towns next to I-70 do not have frontage roads, thus requiring residents to use I-70 all the time. The PEIS does not indicate how traffic mobility will be managed during this period.</p> <p>2. During this 15 year construction period we can expect adverse environmental conditions, severe traffic congestions, major delays in emergency vehicle response time, and loss of significant Colorado revenue as tourists and skiers choose to vacation elsewhere.</p> <p>3. Once the construction period is completed (estimated to be 15 years), the expansion will be obsolete because of continued traffic (growth).</p> <p>4. There will continue to be major construction and traffic problems due to the need to re-surface asphalt approximately every 6 years. As an example, it took CDOT 2 years to re-surface the area between Morrison and Chief Hosa exits.</p> <p>5. Many areas directly next to I-70 will be affected due to highway expansion. These include historic</p>	Written

sites and private land.

6. There has not been sufficient analysis of the loss of revenue for the State of Colorado as a result of prolonged delays, bottleneck traffic, and no alternative routes, all which would affect tourism as well as the quality of life of all Colorado residents using the I-70 corridor. Your own charts show that loss of revenue during the construction period will not begin to approach normal for twenty years.

7. One particular plan for the I-70 expansion appears to cut through a portion of The Saddleback Ridge Estates subdivision, where we reside, in order to provide a direct path for cars traveling east from around the Hidden Valley exit to the Floyd Hill/Beaver Brook exit. This will most likely have a negative impact on water and sewage control for Saddleback residents. The PEIS does not indicate the specific ramifications; nor, does it indicate who will bear the costs of this.

8. The report indicates the largest amount of growth will be occurring in Park County. However, this County is not adjacent to or very close to I-70.

9. CDOT has rejected an alternate proposal, such as an advanced guideway system (monorail type), although there would be a much shorter construction period, less environmental impact during and after construction and less loss of revenue for the State. Maintenance is less costly with an AGS and occurs less frequently. Moreover, use of the system after hours can provide additional revenues to help offset initial start up costs.

We request that CDOT seriously examine these issues. Furthermore, we ask that serious consideration be given to an AGS.

Sincerely,  
Arlynne Stark  
James Mims

Categorized Comment	611	Stauer, Anne	Public	5/24/2005	<p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>May 24, 2005</p> <p>Re: I70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>I have been a resident of Vail since 1962. That I70 is detrimental to my quality of life is an understatement – I can hear it from every room in my house and can not even enjoy my own garden on a summer's day. In my opinion, the detriments of the Interstate far outweigh the benefits.</p> <p>I am writing to oppose additional highway lanes except for the "Minimal Action" Alternative and support the "Rail Alternative" with modifications. The rail alternative should have: Elevated structure Electric Rapid Rail Independent of highway right-of-way Built in phases Spurs from main line to high-volume destinations Integrated feeder and distribution network Constructed with existing designs and technology, no significant R&amp;D needed Construction and operation to commence as soon as feasible.</p> <p>The rail alternative is the only one that provides a sound vehicle by which we can reduce the impacts of I70 to the communities that line it, to wildlife and to waterways.</p> <p>More lanes will do nothing to alleviate traffic. We have seen time and again that building more lanes only leads to more, not less, congestion. Further, expansion will only serve to ensure continued reliance on a form of transportation that is totally outmoded.</p> <p>Sincerely, Anne P. Stauer 100 E. Meadow Dr., #31 Vail, Colorado 81657</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	609	Stauer, Joe	Public	5/24/2005	<p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>May 24, 2005</p> <p>Re: I70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>I have lived in Vail since 1962. During that time I have witnessed the awesome impact that I70 has had on the quality of life in our community and on the environment which we all came here to enjoy.</p> <p>These impacts have been positive economically but very negative from the standpoint of our quality of life and the environment. What used to be a peaceful valley is now a major national transportation thoroughfare, and it seems that the only thing to be done about it is to bury the existing lanes and provide a practical alternative.</p> <p>I am writing to oppose additional highway lanes except for the "Minimal Action" Alternative and support the "Rail Alternative" with modifications. The rail alternative should have: Elevated structure Electric Rapid Rail Independent of highway right-of-way Built in phases Spurs from main line to high-volume destinations Integrated feeder and distribution network Constructed with existing designs and technology, no significant R&amp;D needed Construction and operation to commence as soon as feasible.</p> <p>The rail alternative is the only one that provides a sound vehicle by which we can reduce the impacts of I70 to the communities that line it, to wildlife and to waterways.</p> <p>The proposition of more lanes will do nothing to alleviate traffic, but only serve to ensure continued reliance on an outdated and environmentally damaging form of transportation.</p> <p>If you have any questions, or if I can help in offering a historical perspective on I70 and Vail, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Sincerely, Josef Stauer 100 E. Meadow Dr., #31 Vail, Colorado 81657</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	605	Stauer, Jonathan	Public	5/24/2005	<p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>May 24, 2005</p> <p>Re: I70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy:</p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns with the direction that the I70 Draft PEIS has headed. While there was much optimism that the PEIS might work to solve some of the environmental issues caused by Interstate 70 in the mountain corridor, it seems that the Draft has headed in a direction that concerns itself primarily with issues regarding traffic congestion rather than "to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment" as is required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).</p> <p>While some issues have been addressed superficially, others have been summarily dismissed as being cost ineffective. This has been done to such an extent that the entire exercise seems to have been to provide a legal justification for a foregone conclusion. The Draft PEIS falls far short of the stipulations provided by NEPA and Council on Environmental Quality regulations that the process use the best available science to reach a conclusion that not only addresses the situation being investigated (in this case traffic volume), but also how to address it in the most environmentally acute manner</p>	Online

possible.

As a lifelong resident of Vail, Colorado, I have seen the I70 corridor morph from a lonely Western backwater into what basically amounts to a suburb of metropolitan Denver. The associated environmental damage has been incalculable. Certainly, I70 has played a major roll in the economic success of the communities along the corridor, but what is occurring now, and what will continue to occur should the issue not be addresses in a comprehensive fashion, is the further suburbanification of the mountain corridor, with its associated sprawl and further damage to the environment. A PEIS should address these issues. Sadly, however, much of the methodology in the Draft PEIS that as it has been published has been to avoid issues that are beyond the immediate scope of interstate expansion.

#### Expansion of Interstate 70

Throughout the 20th Century, America's increasing forced reliance on the automobile has been a detriment to the environment and to the social fabric of the United States. By forced reliance I mean the well-documented effort by the oil and automobile companies to funnel Federal and State government monies toward projects that are geared to the automobile. This situation is ongoing. What has resulted is a complete lack of choice to the public in the realm of reliable point to point transportation.

While the expansion of Interstate 70 as envisioned in the Draft PEIS might serve to temporarily mitigate traffic congestion, it will certainly do nothing to solve either the immediate or long-term problem. Despite our best efforts around the country, it has been proven time and time again that we can not build our way out of traffic jams. The only way to solve the problem therefore, is to provide viable alternatives. A revised Draft PEIS, supplemental Draft PEIS or the Final PEIS should address these issues more thoroughly

#### Wetlands, Riparian Areas and Waters of the United States

Already, a number of sections of Interstate 70 (Black Gore Creek for example) are in violation of the Clean Water Act. The Final PEIS should incorporate a detailed summary of current CWA violations as well as immediate, practicable steps to correct these issues, not only how to avoid future violations as does the Draft PEIS. A revised Draft PEIS, supplemental Draft PEIS or the Final PEIS should address these issues more thoroughly

#### Air Quality

The Draft PEIS addresses adequately air quality issues brought about by emissions of future projects and states that vehicles will use the "cleanest fuels available" (I would recommend biodiesel and there is a Colorado company that supplies it – Blue Sun). However it falls far short of addressing the air quality issues that will be generated by the increase of traffic itself should the Interstate be expanded without any offer of alternative transportation, nor does it make any prediction as to which emissions monitored under the Clean Air Act will increase under the various alternatives. Certainly this data would be easily projected based on current average emissions of vehicles purchased in the U.S. and the increases projected in traffic under each of the alternatives. A revised Draft PEIS, supplemental Draft PEIS or the Final PEIS should address these issues more thoroughly.

#### Noise

My house sits in Dowd Canyon at the western most boundary of the Town of Vail. The current noise levels inside my house are unpleasant and sometimes verge on intolerable. The exterior of my house, which sits on approximately half an acre of land on which I pay property taxes is for the most part unusable due to the noise issued from the Interstate.

While the Draft PEIS addresses noise and suggests the application of various barrier methods, a surprising alternative that has not been discussed at all in the document is the possible burial of certain sections of the interstate near communities along the corridor. Certainly, this is a possibility economically due to the large amounts of developable land this would make available, not to mention the environmental improvements that could be made – streams currently running in culverts under the highway could be freed, green space made available, local habitat connections re-established. I refer again to the section of NEPA that I quoted in the first paragraph.

For the immediate future, noise levels could be reduced by employing and strictly enforcing a speed limit of 55 mph or less in those areas of the interstate that pass through populated areas. Further, the Town of Vail has been looking at various forms of pavement that advertise certain noise absorbing qualities.

The economic boon that Interstate 70 has provided for the mountain corridor will cease to be a boon should the issues of noise not be adequately addressed at the soonest possible opportunity. The PEIS process is that opportunity and yet the draft falls far short of utilizing " a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decisionmaking which may have an impact on man's environment;" 42 USC § 4332 (A)

A revised Draft PEIS, supplemental Draft PEIS or the Final PEIS should address these issues more thoroughly

#### Wildlife

While the Draft PEIS goes into some detail regarding Threatened and Endangered Species it lacks a certain amount of specificity in this regard. Further, it does not go into much detail at all about non-threatened species such as ungulates. When it was constructed, I70 cut a number of traditional migration routes. The Draft PEIS says little about restoring these corridors and merely suggests that containing future construction to the current right of way will be sufficient. It is not sufficient, either for the wildlife or under NEPA and CEQ guidelines. A revised Draft PEIS, supplemental Draft PEIS or the Final PEIS should address these issues more thoroughly. Further, introduction of invasive species (i.e. brown headed cowbirds) should be discussed more thoroughly.

#### Recreation

For at least two miles up into National Forest lands, more in some locations, the Interstate 70 is audible, frequently at decibals unpleasant to the human ear and worrisome to animals and yet this aspect of the impact of the interstate does not appear to have been addressed at all in the Draft PEIS. Both the White River National Forest and the Arapahoe National Forest are heavily used recreational areas (as mentioned in the DPEIS). However, noise from the interstate removes many areas from consideration for non-motorized recreation. A revised Draft PEIS, supplemental Draft PEIS or the Final PEIS should address these issues more thoroughly

#### CONCLUSION

I oppose additional highway lanes except for the "Minimal Action" Alternative and support the "Rail Alternative" with modifications:

- o Elevated structure
- o Electric Rapid Rail
- o Independent of highway right-of-way
- o Built in phases
- o Spurs from main line to high-volume destinations
- o Integrated feeder and distribution network
- o Constructed with existing designs and technology, no significant R&D needed
- o Construction and operation to commence as soon as feasible.

My rationale in supporting the "Rail Alternative" is as follows:

- The Rail Alternative provides a viable choice to driving that is far less environmentally damaging than the current scenario. With proper land use planning, implemented by local and county governments, it would reduce the "urban sprawl" that is currently occurring throughout the corridor. An example of this has been the successful light rail line in Toronto, where rail stations became community hubs and centers. Evidence of this can also be seen with the very popular and expanding light rail line in Denver, where real estate in proximity to the rail is increasing in value at a faster rate than the overall market.
- An elevated rail structure would increase the viability of existing migration corridors and would likely serve to restore traditional corridors that were disturbed when I70 was built, provided that those linkages are restored on the ground as well.
- Most of the CWA violations are the result of the application of sand used during winter to make the Interstate passable. A rail system would in effect make the sand unnecessary whereas increasing the number of lanes will increase the sand necessary to make those lanes travelable
- A rail line would, by providing an alternative, decrease the current noise levels throughout the corridor, as opposed to increasing it, which is a foregone conclusion should the interstate be expanded.
- A rail line, powered by electricity, would do much to alleviate the current load of exhaust caused by the interstate, rather than increasing it as would an expansion.
- A rail line would assist in the sustainability of community integrity and quality of life. Expansion will further erode connections between various neighborhoods within existing communities.
- A rail could be used as a national example of what is possible with existing technology to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels.

I urge the Colorado Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration to redraft the DEIS or to issue a supplemental Draft PEIS for further comment. There have been a number of new events and new information matters, not all of which are known to or available to those making comments. Further, the Alternatives in the Draft should be revised and the capital and funding period screen should be altered.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Stauffer  
2992B Bellflower Dr.  
Vail, Colorado 81657

Categorized Comment	449	Stauffer, Jack	Public	4/26/2005	I believe that CDOT should give consideration to the High Speed Monorail originally proposed by CIFGA in the comparisons of alternatives to the PEIS. The characteristics of the HSM were more likely to have met the Corridor goals than any of the other alternatives according to Sato's early calculations. Why was the HSM left out?	Online
Categorized Comment	541	Stearns, Angela	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/22/2005	<p>This letter is in response to the alternatives proposed by the Colorado Department of Transportation's widening of I-70. On May 21, 2005, the Upper Clear Creek Homeowner's Association, comprised of home and land owners located west of Silver Plume to Loveland Ski Area, met to discuss opinions regarding the expansion of I-70 through Clear Creek County.</p> <p>It is the consensus of the majority of the 25 attendees at this meeting, that six lanes for I-70 is not welcome in Clear Creek County and our area. What is preferred, is that the Colorado Department of Transportation work on specific "pinch points" as noted in their PEIS "minimal action preferred alternative," including Eisenhower Tunnel, Georgetown Hill, US 40 and I-70 interchange, as well as the Twin Tunnels located east of Idaho Springs. We understand that the I-70 Coalition's regionally preferred alternative also supports this view.</p> <p>Further noted, regarding the PEIS draft from the Colorado Department of Transportation, is that no noise impact readings or future estimated noise levels were reported west of the Town of Silver Plume. A group of homeowners have taken their own decibel readings with a RadioShack, model 33-4050, Sound Level Meter with the existing "off season" traffic conditions. A hard copy of the readings will be mailed directly to Jean Wallace, Senior Operations Engineer and Cecilia Joy, Project Manager, along with a hard copy of this letter on May 23, 2005 to be delivered May 24, 2005 since I do not have the capability to attach it as a document to this comment field. Noise pollution is an extreme concern of our association's members. Spikes of over 76 decibels have been recorded throughout the daytime and evening hours up and down our valley, including the Herman Gulch area. It is specifically requested that the Colorado Department of Transportation perform a noise impact study from Silver Plume to Herman Gulch. It is also specifically requested that a noise barrier be included for our area, even if NO I-70 alterations are performed. It is felt that there is substantial data that implicates a noise barrier wall be installed.</p> <p>Additionally, it is specifically requested that ANY alterations between Silver Plume and Bakerville, including the proposed greenway, be to the north side of I-70. The Herman Gulch residents, composed of nine residencies, specifically request that any alterations to I-70 be to the south side of the existing highway. It is also specifically requested that the Department of Transportation provide a multiuse greenway bike path through our area as well. It has been noted at local meetings regarding this greenway bike path that the north side of the Frontage Road is an alternative route. However, as I have mentioned at these meetings, a bike path along the north side of the Frontage Road will seriously infringe on the real property and personal property of homeowners on the north side of the road. In addition to the lack of space in front of our residence for the bike path, is the extreme concern of safety for individuals, bicycles, and horses with regard to the traffic congestion that can occur.</p> <p>Finally, presented at our meeting was the concern over the environmental impact of the existing magnesium chloride being used as well as additional usage if I-70 is to be expanded. Since the usage of magnesium chloride began, trees along I-70 have been dying in our backyards. We are extremely concerned about it getting into our streams and our wells. It is specifically requested that a non-biased study of magnesium chloride's impact on the environment be performed. Also noted at the meeting regarding the environment, was the concern that wildlife will be negatively impacted with regard to any work being performed. We would like to be reassured that everything is being done that possibly can be to protect the wildlife in our area.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to express our comments and concerns. We look forward to hearing back regarding the specific issues mentioned above.</p> <p>Respectfully Submitted,</p> <p>Angela Stearns Upper Clear Creek Homeowners Association Representative</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	305	Stearns, Chuck	Municipalities	2/9/2005	<p>I'm Chuck Stearns, town administrator for the Town of Georgetown. One of our board of selectmen, Robby Hodge, will present the official Town of Georgetown letter this evening, but I wanted to hit a few of the highlights.</p> <p>The board of selectmen did compose a letter -- and, first of all, we'd like to thank you for extending the comment period for the additional time. We believe that to be very important, and it's very much appreciated.</p> <p>Our preferred alternative is the advanced guideway system or some other high-speed mass transit alternative. We do not believe that road building has a long-term or significant effect on congestion, and that public and mass transportation can significantly affect the congestion and increase capacity.</p> <p>We are concerned with the apparent lack of life cycle costing in the PEIS. If it is present, it's not well described, and if it isn't present, it needs to be. We believe that if life cycle costing were looked at for longer than a 20-year period, the AGS and transit alternatives would come out faring very much better and would become the preferred alternative.</p> <p>We do not believe that the mitigation on the effects of the alternatives on the Town of Georgetown and its residents is sufficiently addressed in the PEIS. We request a clarification of mitigation policies within the historic landmark district. The impacts during the construction, as you've heard tonight, are a tremendous concern to the area residents and the Town of Georgetown and our businesses and residents.</p> <p>There's insufficient detail in the PEIS on mitigation during the 15 years to enable the board of selectmen and other people to sufficiently make decisions and make recommendations on the PEIS. Leaving the mitigating details to the Tier II studies is insufficient, and we need that information before we can make a decision.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	394	Stearns, Chuck	Municipalities	2/23/2005	<p>My name is Chuck Stearns. I'm the town administrator for the Town of Georgetown. And I have four comments this evening, two of which have been stated before and two which are a little newer.</p> <p>The Georgetown board of selectmen, who are the equivalent of a town council, voted unanimously that our preferred alternative is a high-speed elevated mass transit alternative such as the advanced guideway system or some other alternative. We do not believe that road building has a significant or long-term effect on reducing congestion that -- but that public or mass transportation can reduce congestion.</p> <p>We are concerned about the apparent lack -- or lack of life cycle costing or lack of description of life cycle costing in the PEIS. We believe that if a rigorous analysis were done and it were stretched out over, say, 50 years instead of 20 years, the cost-benefit analysis of the AGS system would reveal much more favorably compared to the highway alternative.</p> <p>In the handout that I've given before and I'll submit tonight, there is a study in evidence that reveals that investments in public transportation create more jobs than investment in road building. To quote from this study, it says: These adjusted figures reveal that investments in public transportation produce nearly 19 percent more jobs than new road or build bridge projects. If President Bush and Governor Owens are interested in job creation, the AGS and/or other high-speed mass transit alternative is the way to go.</p> <p>Fourth, for Summit County residents, and other people have alluded to this evening, I think they should think about what will happen during the 15 years of construction. Many tourists who fly in to ski in the mountains may just fly over DIA and fly into Eagle County Airport. And then where the closest place is, they will go ski. So I think Summit County needs to consider that aspect as other people have alluded to that they may lose out during the 15 years of construction. And those are customers that they may never regain.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts

Categorized Comment	368	Stearns, Chuck	Municipalities	2/16/2005	<p>Good evening, I'm Chuck Stearns. I'm the town administrator for the Town of Georgetown. And Georgetown's equivalent of a town council has voted unanimously to support a high-speed elevated mass transit alternative, either the advanced guideway system or some other mass transit solution. The board of selectmen do not believe that road building can significantly affect congestion but that mass transit can.</p> <p>Inasmuch as this is the public hearing that is closest to the City and County of Denver, I thought of a factor that I haven't heard talked about yet but I think may be important, and I hope the City and County of Denver is evaluating that. And that is the impact on Denver International Airport from 15 years of construction of I-70 up to the mountains.</p> <p>Given the choice, I believe visitors to Colorado traveling into DIA may choose to jump over Denver and I-70 and go to the Eagle County Airport or other locations. I think we should be concerned with the impact of that potential occurrence on DIA's revenues, their landing fees, their ability to make bond service payments and therefore their bond rates. So I think it's important for -- I hope people in the Front Range and the City and County of Denver are evaluating that to see if they can overcome 15 years of congested highways during the construction zone.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	509	Stearns, Chuck	Public	5/17/2005	<p>Let me begin by stating that I fully support the consensus comments and position of the I-70 Coalition which was organized by the Northwest Colorado Coalition of Governments. The trade-offs they made and the consensus they developed should be supported by CDOT and the FHWA. Also here are some more specific comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The PEIS says that CDOT will balance the purpose and need in their preferred alternatives. However I find that the preferred alternatives are based primarily on CDOT's ability to implement the alternatives and there is insufficient balancing of the need with the stated purposes of community values, environmental sensitivity, and safety.</li> <li>2. My preferred alternative is a high-speed, elevated, mass transit alternative, either the Advanced Guideway System (AGS) in Alternative #3 or some other high speed, elevated, mass transit alternative. I also support specific, targeted highway improvements to address safety aspects and bottlenecks such as the Twin Tunnels. The expansion of I-70 to six lanes of highway throughout Clear Creek County would expand the detrimental impacts on Georgetown and further erode our historic resources. I do not believe that road building has a long term or significant effect on congestion, but that public transportation or mass transit investments can reduce congestion.</li> <li>3. Safety does not appear to be a priority in the PEIS for any of the preferred alternatives. The Georgetown-Silver Plume Hill has proven to be deadly because of geologic hazards. Geologic hazards are not considered a determining factor for alternative choices in the PEIS. What are the plans to improve safety in this area?</li> <li>4. I object to the apparent lack of any life cycle costing analysis in the I-70 PEIS. A search of all 1377 pages of the PEIS and its appendices revealed only one mention of the word life-cycle and that was in relation to wildlife, not costs. Had CDOT and J.F. Sato and Associates performed a rigorous life-cycle costing analysis of each alternative, especially for a longer time frame than 20 years, I believe the cost effectiveness index of transit alternatives would have compared much more favorably with the highway alternatives and the ranking would have been much different. I believe that a comprehensive life-cycle costing analysis of each alternative should be done before a preferred alternative is selected.</li> <li>5. Noise from I-70 is a very important issue to Georgetown and the residents and property owners. The AGS alternative is one of the most quiet alternatives and other mass transit alternatives are as quiet, so this is another important reason for our favoring of mass transit solutions over building more highway lanes. It is unclear how environmental and community values will be used in the selection of preferred alternatives.</li> <li>6. I do not believe that mitigation on the effects of all of the alternatives on Georgetown residents and property owners is sufficiently addressed in the PEIS. Page ES-50 of the PEIS says that mitigation policies and strategies will be shaped to the preferred alternative as a result of public comment and review of the Draft PEIS and will be presented in the final EIS. However, leaving the evaluation and estimation of costs for mitigation to the subsequent Tier 2 process makes it impossible to understand the implications of all the alternatives.</li> <li>7. Impacts during construction are a tremendous concern to the Georgetown businesses. Most of the details to address construction impacts, mitigation, and strategies are left to the Tier 2 studies, so it is difficult for me to comment on the different alternatives if I cannot understand how the construction impacts and mitigation of a 15 year construction process for each alternative might affect us. A study of economic impacts of construction on Clear Creek County should be done prior to the selection of a preferred alternative.</li> <li>8. The use of person miles of travel (PMT) in the denominator does not fully take into account congestion caused by truck and freight traffic, thus the denominator is invalid and it skews the use of the cost effectiveness index (ref Section 2.3.7.7 -- page 2-114). Much of the traffic generated for mountain resort towns is generated by the vigorous home building industry and the materials and supplies which are trucked into and within the mountain corridor to support this burgeoning industry.</li> <li>9. There are contradictions in the mitigation discussion in the PEIS whether variations to the standard CDOT designs will be possible or whether variances or "context sensitive design" can be used. I would respectfully submit the Georgetown-Silver Plume National Landmark District and the Georgetown hill area are places where "context sensitive design" is appropriate and we hereby request that it be used in these areas.</li> <li>10. I am concerned about possible impacts on the area's bighorn sheep population. Salt residue by the interstate attracts the sheep and both the residue and noise impacts may affect the sheep as identified by the Colorado Division of Wildlife. The Georgetown area is a critical calving area for the sheep and Georgetown was the first wildlife viewing station for viewing bighorn sheep. This resource is a vital part of our local economy and community.</li> <li>11. I am concerned about the impact that a roadway expansion, retaining walls, and cantilevers will have on the Historic Landmark District. Of particular concern is the destruction or relocation of the bicycle path between Georgetown and Silver Plume. Not only is this path an important recreational resource, it is also an emergency access for our police and fire departments to travel between the two towns when I-70 is closed or congested.</li> <li>12. CDOT should do further review and consideration of an incline tunnel as an alternative to the Georgetown Hill roadway. Rockfall, noise, and viewshed impacts around Georgetown all point to a renewed consideration of a possible incline tunnel alternative.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Chuck Stearns</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	147	Stearns, Chuck	Municipalities	1/12/2005	<p>My name is Chuck Stearns. I'm the town administrator for the Town of Georgetown, 404 Sixth Street in Georgetown. The board of selectmen for the Town of Georgetown unanimously approved three pages of preliminary comments, and Robby Hodge gave those to the court reporter. They unanimously wanted a 90-day extension on the comment period. They strongly and unanimously supported a high-speed elevated mass transit while opposing lane expansion.</p> <p>We are concerned about a life cycle cost analysis not being evident in the PEIS document. If it is evident, it's not very well explained or very well detailed, and 20 years is too short of a time frame to consider life cycle costs.</p> <p>Finally, the impacts and mitigation during construction are not developed enough during this Tier I process to allow them to sufficiently make decisions on the alternatives and allow for good decision making.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	180	Stearns, Jerry	Public	1/15/2005	<p>Our concerns are the 65 mile an hour through the tunnels. The groundwater problem for Saddle Back is our main concern because of the municipal water system. Is this something that is going to be forced upon us if it progresses that far, or are we still going to be able to utilize our well and septic?</p> <p>I'm president of the Saddle Back Mountain Homeowners HOA. You've got Floyd Hill, which is the east side where -- we're concerned about the traffic congestion, quality of life for -- and I'm trying to think of the residents in the corridor -- and the business aspects.</p> <p>The 90-day period should be extended because of their lack of efficiency to get the word out.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	71	Stearns, Mary	Public	1/15/2005	<p>Water concerns for Floyd Hill homeowners. How much contamination? Water supply for homes?</p> <p>The public needs answers. Where are the monies coming from?</p>	Form

Put a list of all concerned comments and notify the public with this list and let them make the decision.

Categorized Comment	472	Stearns, Susan	Public	5/3/2005	I am a resident of Jefferson County, (Evergreen) and I have a second home in Vail and have had other second homes in Summit County in the past. I have had second homes in Summit and Eagle Counties since 1983. I also lived in Vail in the early 1970s before and after the Johnson Eisenhower Tunnel was built. I have seen an incredible change in the I70 use from the days when it was a big deal to stop at Frisco Drug to these days when it is a big deal not to get stopped in the weekend traffic for 3 or more hours around Georgetown. In many ways I am not as affected as most people since owning a second home allows me to go to the mountains on Friday night and leave on Monday morning. However, I have seen a great increase in this traffic in the last 5-8 years. Some good things have been done in cracking down on the trucks that do not put chains on and this new law that is supposed to create a ticketable offense for driving in the right lane and not allowing other to pass (assuming it is enforced) may help, but the real problem is volume.  I am a firm believer that most of the people sitting in I-70 for 3 or more hours for an hour and a half trip would much prefer to sit in a "monorail" car, sipping coffee, reading the newspaper on the way up to the mountains and enjoy a glass of wine on the way home, instead of experiencing the road rage or frustration caused by the delays. Even if the road were widened, an accident or weather can cause delays and frustration. Moreover with the cost of gas, parking at the mountain areas, the cost of driving, the time, etc., in my opinion, a public transportation solution is far superior to widening the highway. Personally I favor the monorail and would love to see it happen in my lifetime. I would use this all the time. Perhaps I am somewhat unique in having the second home up there, but mountain day users would certainly use this alternative and so would a lot of the second homeowners. This would free up the roads for truck and persons for whom the public transportation is not feasible, ie persons going off the beaten trail for camping. However, I think that such users could still use the public transportation alternative depending upon the transportation available at the departure points.  If this were set up not as a train running two or three times a day, but as a constant stream of smaller rail alternatives, this would be an incredible solution to pollution, gas shortage and expense, time constraints, costs of parking, speeding tickets, road rage, accidents, etc. My husband travels a lot and has used Colorado Mountain Express to get up to Vail and finds that it is a good alternative to driving up and having two cars in Vail, but truly with the transportation infrastructure already in place, ie the busses, etc., we would not need any cars up there. Please consider the future and think again about alternatives that could include the monorail or similar light rail alternative to more highway and paving. Thank You Susan Stearns	Online
Categorized Comment	691	Upper Clear Creek Homeowners Association	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/23/2005	May 23, 2005  Federal Highway Administration Jean Wallace P. E., Senior Operations Engineer 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228  Dear Jean,  Enclosed, please find a copy of the comment I submitted online regarding the proposed changes to I-70 through Clear Creek County from the Upper Clear Creek Homeowners Association. I was not able to submit my data collected regarding sound level readings as an attachment to the online comment, so I am sending you and Cecilia Joy at the Colorado Department of Transportation the readings.  Thank you for your time regarding our issues.  Sincerely,  Angela Stearns PO Box 987 Silver Plume, Colorado 80476 303/569-3072  Enclosures: General Comment Letter Submitted May 22, 2005, 2 Pages Sound Level Readings, 6 Pages	Written
Categorized Comment	356	Stein, Jennifer	Public	2/16/2005	Hi. My name is Jennifer Stein. I'm a resident of Lakewood.  After attending the first public hearing on January 10, I walked away very concerned with what I heard about the I-70 mountain corridor expansion. I have one question for CDOT. Why are you primarily considering a preferred alternative that's impact on the Front Range communities is 15 years of impaired access to the mountains? In 15 years my youngest child will be 22 years old.  For 15 years, gone or limited will be her ability to go skiing, climb a 14,000-footer, camp in the gorgeous Rocky Mountains or, most importantly, to visit her grandparents in Clear Creek County. And after enduring the construction mess for 15 years, she will again sit in the traffic for hours and hours on I-70 because it's projected that population growth by 2025 will make the congestion just as bad as it is today.  And what is this business about tolling the new highway, thus eliminating our access further? Why are you not seriously considering alternative solutions like the high-speed monorail system which could be up and running in five years and not obsolete the day it opens? CDOT, please rethink this. Don't let big businesses and dollar signs impair your thinking and limit our children from experiencing Colorado's Rockies.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	14	Stevenson, John	Public	1/6/2005	I would hope that you would include a section on the geology and ALL the mineral resources (including sand and gravel) that might be affected by this project. If there is NO impact this should be stated, if there are an impacts, then explain what will be done to the mineral resources.	Online
Categorized Comment	718	Stewart, Duane	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action - fix 'choke' points, modify travel demand (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  No response.	Written
Categorized Comment	739	Stiegelmeier, Karn	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  We need to fix the 'choke points'. We need a true vision for transportation, not just highway auto travel. We need mass transit. karn.stiegelmeier 334 hillside drive silverthorne, co frankarn@colorado.net	Written
Categorized Comment	493	Stiegelmeier, Karn	Public	5/13/2005	The PEIS does not fulfill the purpose of the document. It does not adequately address the ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. This document uses cost as the factor for preference of action. The purpose of this process is to establish environmental impacts. In fact, environmental impacts are mentioned in general with the assumption that they will be mitigated. There should not be such assumptions in this document. There should be an evaluation of the environmental impacts.  There are significant impacts to air quality, water quality, wildlife habitat and migration as well as noise pollution that are glossed over, not evaluated to any reasonable degree. There is an assumption throughout the PEIS that environmental factors are not a concern. The purpose of this document should be to evaluate the impacts, not gloss over them and assume they will be mitigated.  The document, then in reality looks at economic factors, not environmental factors. These are very important, but to my understanding, that is not the purpose of this document. I believe CDOT has failed to adequately study the environmental impacts. Therefore, the study is meaningless.  The study was clearly conducted with a predetermined outcome that CDOT wanted - which is to six lane the interstate. Any mass transit option plus others that were not considered, would have far less environmental impact. My understanding is that the purpose of the PEIS is to determine the relative environmental impact. The conclusions of this document are based on an arbitrary and capricious budget that was artificially imposed. The conclusions don't relate to the environmental impact.  Of the economic factors, there is no consideration for what costs the towns and counties will bear for additional required parking and infrastructure. This alone makes even the economic aspect of the document flawed and biased against mass transit and for 6 laning.  In short, it is clear to me and most people I have spoken to that this document had a predetermined	Online



				outcome and all evaluation was based on the assumption that six laning the highway was to be the chosen alternative. It is biased throughout. There is no valid environmental impact analysis in this document.	
				I hope CDOT and the leaders involved in funding any improvements for this corridor consider the true needs of the people of this state.	
				Sincerely, Karn Steigemeier	
Categorized Comment	220	Stiegelmeier, Karn	Public	2/23/2005	Written
				I see I-70 Mt Highway Lane Expansion as a disaster for all Coloradans.	
				The alternative of simply adding additional lanes impacts our mountain counties' environmental quality, the reason we live here and visitors want to come here. We survive on tourism. Tourism will suffer in the 15 years of construction period, and then afterwards, the Corridor will lose the qualities that bring tourism to Colorado.	
				Impacts to our environment in terms of water and air quality, wildlife impacts, community values and economic impacts are disclosed. Those disclosures did not shape the selection of the preferred alternatives.	
				Capital cost to CDOT appears to be the sole criterion, without consideration of the costs to the communities affected. Spending money just to loose what we value makes no sense.	
				We all know that CDOT wants a final alternative of only more highway lanes. The irreversible and non-sustainable damage to the environment, communities and health are contrary to the public input received and seemingly ignored. It is contrary to the wishes of our community as expressed by votes and polls time and time again.	
				I support a fixed guideway transit system using rail technology. I also support studying the option of a non CDOT Train alternative.	
				I believe specific safety issues can be improved with spot improvements; there's no need to pave more lanes.	
				I would like to see CDOT use environmental and community impacts as essential criteria in the final analysis instead of only capital costs. There isn't any benefit/cost and other economic analyses to compare alternatives.	
				We need a vision of what a preferred alternative will do for the future of our mountain communities already taxed with more sprawl and pavement than is desirable.	
				Thank you.	
Categorized Comment	770	Stiltner, Barbara	Public	5/18/2005	Written
				1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)	
				2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.	
				I believe that we need to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and reduce the pollution being added to our environment.	
Categorized Comment	618	Stokstad, Peggy	Public	5/25/2005	Online
				Cecilia...I know that we are all glad this this part of the process has ended. And, as a private citizen I'd like to encourage you to read and absorb the contents of the comments and then find a way to do the right thing. Maybe the PEIS did not include all the possibilities for the corridor and innovative approaches to solve the access difficulties to the high country are yet to be identified. This is a unique environmental challenge. Clear Creek County will not survive the 15 years of massive construction projects outlined in CDOT's preferred alternatives. We've got to pursue the transit options along with limited improvements. Thank you in advance for your consideration. I look forward to working with you in the future. Peggy Stokstad	
Categorized Comment	177	Stokstad, Peggy	Public	1/15/2005	Transcripts
				My name is Peggy Stokstad. I'm the president of the Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation. And, I almost forgot, but, yes, 20 years ago I was a Clear Creek County commissioner. And I am also a resident of the eastern portion of Clear Creek, so your comments in regard to those of us, the huge population -- the Clear Creek County's population that lives in that area, yes, we do care very deeply. I live within 50 feet of Jeffco County line, and we share that concern as much as any other citizen in Clear Creek County.	
				We note that all of CDOT's preferred alternatives are in the greatest construction impact grouping. These impacts are described on pages 2 through 64 and 2 through 68, and again on 3.9 to 17 through 3.9 through 20. Although we have issues with the impacts described, a thorough analysis of the mobility impairment of our economic and social fabrics during the 15-year construction period of incremental highway widening is missing. That is like asking us to approve or decide on something of a \$4 billion magnitude without having the details. Nobody conducts business that way, even CDOT.	
				And without fully studying the billions of dollars of impacts that the 15-year construction projects will have on Clear Creek County, the mountain corridor, and the state of Colorado, the mountain communities along the I-70 corridor are the most travel-dependent regions of the state. We believe that these impacts are of a magnitude from which we cannot recover. This makes Clear Creek County an economic wasteland for highways. It also has a profound and cumulative impact on the economies of the Front Range and the Western Slope communities.	
				The Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation asks that CDOT grant an extension to allow for the communities to study details and compile descriptive and direct responses to the alternatives and assumptions and allow us time to develop and study an impact economic -- an economic impact model that will come close to actual economic impacts during a 15-year construction period with data before a final decision is made and allow the time to look at an actual cost analysis of the alternatives. We would prefer high-speed transit.	
				Thank you very much for your time. And I'll see you next week.	
Categorized Comment	386	Stokstad, Peggy	Public	2/23/2005	Transcripts
				Good evening. I'm Peggy Stokstad, president of the Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation. Good to see you again this evening.	
				I've got several comments to make tonight. We recognize that the assumptions and alternatives presented are logical to CDOT as purveyors of pavement, but they show that CDOT, in fact, does not perceive the value of places. The overall purpose does not intend -- does not take into account Clear Creek County's community values, page ES-1.	
				CDOT's boilerplate justifications are shortsighted, narrow in focus, circular in argument, rigid and without vision. Our children must raise families, make livings, run the economies, and be stewards of Clear Creek County long after Colorado has run out of asphalt. Therefore, from very deep values that you have yet to perceive, we believe that the technology of solely adding lanes along the I-70 mountain corridor as it passes through Clear Creek County does not meet the needs and purposes stated in the draft PEIS.	
				I feel the Tier I analysis is incomplete as it does not address critical issues and effects of business from impacted interchanges, community isolation, population erosion, business loss, removal of land for additional right-of-way, et cetera.	
				Tier I falls short of addressing these paramount impacts. And if CDOT has reserved information regarding these impacts, please divulge these facts to us now.	
				In an effort to fully and accurately analyze the I-70 corridor PEIS, Clear Creek County is enlisting the help of experts in their field to identify impacts, omissions, errors, assumptions, and additional information that will help us in our detailed evaluation of this voluminous document. We know that it is the lack of information that we must now generate ourselves or through our experts at great expense that will give us greater insight as to what our response to CDOT's grouping of preferred alternatives -- or evaluate alternatives that are not currently being considered by CDOT.	
				I also ask that CDOT consider additional public forums until May so that, one, we can continue to educate the public in regard to the process and preferred alternatives; give the public, both Front Range and Colorado-wide an opportunity to provide public input; allow the press to publicize the issues; finalize our expert reports and its conclusions, and that will provide a level of detail that will lead us to a reasonable evaluation of the alternatives; and five, consider the long-term statewide effects of bad transportation planning.	
				Thank you.	

Categorized Comment	304	Stokstad, Peggy	Public	2/9/2005	<p>From Peggy Stokstad, president of the Clear Creek County Economic Development Corporation.</p> <p>I don't have a prepared statement for this evening, because frankly, I have pages and pages of notes. I can't even read my own writing because they're late at night on my bed or in my bed reading that document. I have mostly questions. These questions aren't answered in the PEIS.</p> <p>Out of Section -- part of NEPA requires that the evaluation of the socioeconomic impacts of the alternatives study be studied in the EIS. In 3.9, a quote from the PEIS admits that at this point it is simply not possible to predict what is going to happen, when and where and to what degree. And you ask us for a vote of confidence. No way.</p> <p>I'd like to see a show hands of those people who are in favor of mass transit tonight. Let there be a record of that vote.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	56	Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation	Associations & Special Interest Groups	1/12/2005	<p>January 12, 2005</p> <p>David A. Nicol Division Administrator FHWA 12300 West Dakota Ave. Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Torn Norton Executive Director Colorado Department of Transportation 4201 E. Arkansas Avenue Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Re: 1-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement &amp; Section 4(f) Evaluation</p> <p>Dear Messrs. Nicol and Norton:</p> <p>The Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation is a 20 year old organization that focuses on business development, quality of life issues that affect the local economy, operates a commercial lending program for Clear Creek and Gilpin Counties, and addresses issues that impact the economic stability of our community. The Board of Directors is comprised of the mayors of four of the municipalities, the County, and representatives from a geographically diverse community.</p> <p>The Corporation finds that the 90-day response period is insufficient for the amount information and detail presented and considering the December holiday break. Therefore, we ask that the response period be extended to allow for examination and adequate response to this voluminous document. CCEDC has reviewed (not in detail) the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and finds it grossly lacking in understanding of our community, its residents and businesses. In particular we take issue with the responses to local concerns, pages ES-14 through ES-51. We take issue with CDOT's assumptions regarding the impacts this major construction project will have on our citizens living on the eastern and western portions of the community.</p> <p>We recognize that the assumptions and alternatives presented are logical to CDOT as purveyors of pavement but they show that CDOT, in fact, does not perceive the value of places. The overall purpose does not indeed take into account Clear Creek County's community values, page ES-1. CDOT's boilerplate justifications are shortsighted, narrow in focus, circular in argument, rigid, and without vision. Our children must raise families, make livings, run economics, and be stewards of Clear Creek County long after Colorado has run out of asphalt. Therefore, from very deep values that you have not yet perceived, we believe that the technology of solely adding lanes along the I-70 mountain corridor, as it passes through Clear Creek County, does not meet the purpose and needs stated in the Draft PEIS. The Colorado Department of Transportation has eliminated advanced guideway systems, e.g. the CHSST Colorado 200 System or its equivalent, from the mix of preferred alternatives. CDOT has compared very different modes, design lives, life cycle costs and fundability. The Agency has suppressed from public view the feasibility report on CHSST in the I-70 corridor that was recently developed by the Federal Transit Administration and your spokesperson continues to fraudulently refer to the technology as "pie in the sky."</p> <p>We note that all of the CDOT "preferred" alternatives are in the greatest construction impact grouping. These impacts are described on pages 2-64 through 2-68 and again on 3.9-17 through 3.9-20. Although we have issues with the impacts described, a thorough analysis of mobility impairment on our economics and social fabric during the 15-year construction period of incremental highway widening is missing. That is like asking us to approve or decide on something of a \$4B magnitude without having the details! Nobody conducts business that way... even CDOT! - and without fully studying the billions of dollars of impacts these 15-year construction projects will have on Clear Creek County, the I-70 mountain corridor and the State of Colorado. The mountain communities, along the I-70 corridor, are the most travel dependent regions in the State. We believe that these impacts are of a magnitude from which we cannot recover. This makes Clear Creek County an economic wasteland for highways. It also has a profound and cumulative impact on the economies of the Front Range and western slope communities. During the 15-year construction period the direct economic impacts to Clear Creek County will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No growth and loss of sales tax from which our communities depend for services at a period when we need to build a base for a much needed replacement economy for the Henderson Mine.</li> <li>• No growth and possible loss of population with the adverse effects of the construction and deterrent to relocate to the area thus affecting property values.</li> <li>• No growth and loss of permanent business relocations and expansions due to the lack of fluent mobility along the I-70 corridor.</li> <li>• At present at least 50% of Clear Creek County's residents commute to Denver for employment. The long-term construction will affect their ability to work in Denver and live in the foothills.</li> <li>• People moving out of the area will decrease the student population in the School District causing hardship in meeting the educational needs.</li> <li>• Property values along the I-70 corridor are expected to decrease.</li> </ul> <p>• Interference with a proposed \$500,000,000 project that the community is working on to replace the Henderson Mine tax base.</p> <p>Some of the impacts of travel in Clear Creek, Summit and Gilpin Counties for 2003:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$33.4 million tax revenues generated by travel spending in 2003.</li> <li>• \$140 million in earnings by major industries in the three county area.</li> <li>• 6,500 jobs generated by travel</li> <li>• \$502 million in visitor spending at destinations</li> </ul> <p>Mountain resort visitor spending in 2003 was over \$2 billion. So, if you multiply the travel impacts throughout the region by 15 and then assume a negative impact of revenues of 50% per year (?), where does that leave us?</p> <p>It is for the reasons of these anticipated cumulative impacts, that the Rural Resort Coalition has been formed to answer to your lack of understanding and vision. CCEDC believes CDOT is being responsive to the highway lobby and forgetting the people and communities that you are sworn to serve.</p> <p>The Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation asks that CDOT grant an extension to allow for the communities to study details and compile descriptive and direct responses to the alternatives and assumptions, allow us time to develop and study an economic impact model that will come close to actual economic impacts during the 15 year construction period with data before a final decision is made and allow the time to look at an actual cost analysis of alternatives we would prefer (high speed transit included). There are so many variables omitted that a supplemental report should be initiated.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your cooperation in these matters as it will benefit this high profile, controversial, costly and politically charged project.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Peggy Stokstad President/CEO</p> <p>cc: Governor Bill Owens Speaker of the House, Representative Andrew Romanoff President of the Senate, Senator Joan FitzGerald US Congressman Mark Udall US Senator Wayne Allard US Senator Ken Salazar</p>	Written

Categorized Comment	680	Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement	Written
Comments						
Prepared by: Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation						
Peggy Stokstad President CEO						
502 Sixth Street PO Box 2030 Georgetown, CO 80444 Phone: 303/569-2133 Fax: 303/569-3940 E-mail: pstokstad@clearcreekedc.org Web: www.clearcreekedc.com						
May 24, 2005						
Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 E. Colfax Ave. Aurora, CO 80011						
Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 W. Dakota Ave. Lakewood, CO 80228						
Re: I-70 Draft PEIS, Comments for the Administrative Record by the Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation						
The Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation has analyzed the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and will focus its comments primarily on Section 3.9 and Appendix J, Social and Economic Values. In addition, and in consultation with NEPA and economic experts, the Corporation presents information and comments under separate covers that addresses health impacts, disclosure of documents to the public, segmentation, Section 106, and economics, and is being submitted by Robert Vincze of Greenberg Traurig, LLP, on the Corporation's behalf						
The I-70 Mountain Corridor in Colorado is like no other. It cannot be compared to any transportation corridor in the United States and should be given the critical attention to assure that this Colorado lifeline not suffer the consequences of transportation planning mistakes (asphalt, as usual) with impacts and subsequent consequences from which it might not be able to ever fully recover.						
Because Clear Creek County is unique in character, location, economy, and topography, the regional basis of the Draft PEIS information, impacts and evaluation results in an analysis by CDOT that is flawed, misleading and narrow in focus.						
The extent of economic development effects can be radically different depending on whether the defined area is a city, county, region or state. The input factors and variables used in REM generated economic data used by CDOT that cannot clearly predict the economic impacts of the preferred alternatives on a community that is clearly different in economy, environment and location of the rest of the region, 3.9-13						
NEPA requires an evaluation of socio economic impacts of the alternatives in the PEIS, Tier 1. With that in mind, Section 3.9 falls short of the requirement. The best method and level of effort for any given project depends on the scale, complexity and controversy of the project. The economic impacts in the Draft PEIS falls short of evaluating the specific economic impacts to Clear Creek County. The public needs the level of detail that will lead them to a reasonable evaluation of the alternatives and to consider the long-term effects of large scale transportation planning. CDOT states, "Detailed evaluations of localized impacts are beyond the scope of a Tier 1 PEIS." The REM model used by CDOT in their analysis does have the ability to evaluate the impacts of each county for both the commuters and businesses. The REM TranSight model could determine detailed economic impacts associated with the I-70 Corridor on a year-by-year basis and county-by-county basis with a 50 year forecast. This information was presented to Peggy Stokstad, President of CCEDC, in a letter from Frederick Trey, CEO of REM. A thorough analysis of mobility impairment of our communities and erosion of the social fabric during the 15-year construction period of incremental highway widening is missing.						
Further, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) defines in Chapter 5, page 5.1, reasonable alternatives as "those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense." The arbitrary \$4B construction cap, established without detailed revenue sources, does not meet the reasonableness of economic feasibility and a standard (choosing an alternative without verified revenue sources) even CDOT has not pursued before. "Cost and affordability will play a role in the selection of the alternative", states CDOT. "An alternative that is not financially viable is not reasonable as defined by CEQ and does not meet the intent of NEPA." The arbitrary cap does not take into consideration the cost of mitigation necessary to implement the 15-year construction period which could raise the cost of alternatives dramatically and well beyond the \$4B cap.						
While CDOT states that a more detailed analysis of the economic impacts and mitigation measures will be addressed in Tier 2 of the PEIS, it is unreasonable for CDOT to ask for the public to comment on any preferred alternative prior to the critical issues, effects, and impacts to businesses that will result from impacted interchanges, community isolation, population erosion, business loss over a substantial period of time, and removal of land for additional row of way facts are revealed.						
Major Comments and Findings						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic impacts, as outlined in the PEIS, are for the region as a whole while REM has the ability to analyze data for each county. The regional economic analysis is a major flaw to the Draft PEIS. The regional modeling effect captures the aggregated multiplier effects. The TranSight Model can detail county-by-county data for a 50-year window and the Economic Development Research Group can augment their new analysis tools to REM to compile a complete economic picture.</li> </ul>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Economic activity in the corridor is tourism based as exemplified by cross-county commuting patterns", 3.9-13. Tourism is the focus industry exclusive of all other industries and economies. Region wide tourism generates 41% of the jobs and 38% of the income. In Clear Creek County tourism accounts for 20% of the jobs and only 12% of the income with commuter households bringing in the most significant economic activity accounting for 30% of all County jobs and income. Appendix J, 1.4-3 Economics and Tourism. Use another weighing variable other than tourism, i.e., miles of highway impacted by construction – one that takes into account the importance of the roadway to commuters.</li> </ul>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 56% of Clear Creek County workers commute outside the County each day, mostly to the Front Range. For that reason Clear Creek County is unique and cannot be compared in the sales tax per capita chart and analysis, 3.9-18, Section, Regional Economic Perspective, Chart 3.9-20, County Per Capita Retail Sales. Also, the County is situated 30 minutes from Denver and much of the County is a mountain bedroom community to Denver. Commuter households bring in the most significant economic activity accounting for 30% of all income. A State sales tax average should be used comparing the retail activity to the State per capita average instead of the regional approach (the State per capita value being nearly \$5,000 less than the nine county per capita figure). <a href="http://dola.colorado.gov/demog/Population/PopulationTotals/Forecasts/C">http://dola.colorado.gov/demog/Population/PopulationTotals/Forecasts/C</a></li> </ul>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Section 3.9-18, CDOT makes the assumption that we currently do not gain much in sales tax from I-70 and "only Idaho Springs has demonstrated any ability to reap a significant harvest from the visitor trade."</li> </ul>						
These are very negative and misleading comments.						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix J, 1.10.7, Economic Methodology, shows a very low weight of 2.5 given to Clear Creek County Values. This does not capture our impacts and shows a skewing toward the ski areas. A result of the regionalization of the approach.</li> </ul>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix J-22, Value of Time (VoT). Unclear how this elements feeds into the total analysis. Since Clear Creek County has a larger outflow of commuters, is absorbing most of the construction and most travel the I-70 corridor to the Front Range to work each day. This analysis is very important to Clear Creek County and assumes a greater cost in terms of time and value of time.</li> </ul>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CDOT needs to explain how they will mitigate impacts now. NEPA requires an evaluation of socio economic impacts of the alternatives in the PEIS. We ask for this detail on mitigation in Tier 1. There are inconsistent, inadequate, and even contradictory statements regarding commitment to mitigation. They also need to factor in costs of the projects and economic impacts to the Corridor, communities, Front Range, and Colorado. Construction analysis assumes impacts are spread among nine counties. The Draft PEIS does not address critical issues and effects to businesses, historic economic development, etc. Clear Creek County asks for exemplary mitigation to its County, towns, and to its citizens.</li> </ul>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Project alternative construction is not likely to be a major burden on the bulk of the County's residents." "The majority or large portion of the Clear Creek County population will not be affected." 3.9-20. Erroneous assumptions. Most Clear Creek County citizens travel the I-70 corridor each day.</li> </ul>						

Economic impacts resulting from the 15-year construction period will impact all taxpayers.

- Construction impacts are spread over nine counties when Clear Creek County will absorb most of the construction for the 15-year construction window. Clear Creek County along with other Corridor counties should be analyzed individually for impacts.

- Section 3.9-6. Employment by industry sector, tourism, vacation/second homes and retirees, does not describe Clear Creek County. Clear Creek County's unique location excludes it from the impacts of these variables.

- The I-70 Corridor is one of the most travel dependent corridors in the State. Dean Runyan and Assoc., Colorado Travel Impacts, 1998-2003, and that the impacts of the construction period will impact the entire State, certainly the Front Range. Study the economic impacts of the Front Range and Colorado's tourism economy over the 15-year construction period. Some current and relevant socio economic data:

- Population of 9,782 in 2005 representing a 28.39% increase in 15 years.

- Nearly 56% of the work force commutes outside the County to work.

- Clear Creek County's annual wage \$29,861 in 2003 and falls well below the State average of \$38,942 and below the regional average.

- Retail, government and the service sectors account for the majority of jobs in 2002.

- In 2002 Clear Creek County had a per capita personal income of \$37,276, ranking 8th in the State.

- County sales tax totaled \$720,682 in 2004 with an annual average yearly increase of 4% since 1993.

- Aging population causing a declining enrollment in public schools.

- Currently \$800,000,000 in investments being pursued in the County.

#### Conclusion

Economic development refers to progress toward a community's economic goals, including increases in economic productivity, employment, business activity and investment. Economic development can include nonmarket impacts related to human health, environmental quality, equity and quality of life, and so can differ from economic growth, which only reflects material wealth. These issues are paramount and critical to the future of Clear Creek County and leads to the level of distress at the lack and adequate level of detail of the impacts of these factors prior to making a decision, thus violating the intent of the NEPA process.

Again, CEQ defines reasonable alternatives as "Those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense." The fundability and sustainability factors lead to alternatives that are not currently presented in total in CDOT's preferred alternatives. The lack of in depth study and analysis of Sections 106 and 4(f) provides less than the requirement for an environmentally unique, sensitive, and historically rich corridor.

The Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation endorses the "Regionally Preferred Alternative."

This alternative calls for planning and development of transit to proceed along with highway improvements that address the pinch points first and over four phases an evaluation between the phases will access whether to proceed with the next phase of highway improvements. CCEDC asks CDOT to consider minimal highway improvements now with further collaboration, consideration, and study of mass transit solutions to take place simultaneous. In addition, exploration of alternative east/west routes from the Front Range to west slope communities must be a consideration.

However, a thorough analysis and mobility impairment study of our economies and social fabric during the 15-year construction period of incremental highway widening is missing. CDOT cannot ask or expect that a population will make a \$4B historical decision without knowing the full impacts or ramifications of those decisions. This leads to CCEDC asking for a supplemental study to address mitigation measures, analyze Clear Creek County apart from the region due to its location, difference in economies, historic properties, environmental concerns, and due to the fact that it will absorb most of the construction during the 15-year period.

Respectfully submitted,  
Peggy Stokstad, President/CEO  
Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation

Categorized Comment	763	Stoller, Renee	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>With current energy crisis and little legislative action to change our reliance on oil, we must find alternative mass transportation.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	701	Stone, Alastair	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	544	Stone, Courtney	Public	5/23/2005	<p>Courtney Stone May 23, 2005</p> <p>ENDANGERED PLANTS AND ANIMALS OF COLORADO</p> <p>I am here on behalf of all of the endangered plants and animals that are going to be affected by the remodeling of I-70. Throughout the many states that I-70 goes through, there are many endangered plants and animals. All of them are going to be affected in more harmful ways than helpful. You are destroying all of their food, homes, and lives.</p> <p>We have laws on killing endangered animals and picking endangered plants for a reason, so we can try and repopulate them. We don't have people watching out for these plants and animals just because they have nothing better to do. Its because they care and don't want to see them dead! If we wanted them dead there wouldn't be laws on killing them or people wouldn't be trying to protect them, now would we? What do you think blowing up the mountains is going to do, keep them alive and safe? The part that blows my mind the most is building through two of our national forest where there are both plants and animals!</p> <p>Some of the endangered animals include:</p> <p>Mammals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. River Otter</li> <li>2. Spotted Bat</li> <li>3. Antelope jackrabbit</li> <li>4. Bobcat</li> <li>5. Colorado Chipmunk</li> <li>6. Coyote</li> <li>7. Gray Wolf</li> </ol> <p>Birds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acorn Woodpecker</li> <li>2. American Black Duck</li> <li>3. American Robin</li> <li>4. Falcon</li> <li>5. Bald Eagle</li> <li>6. Barn Owl</li> </ol> <p>Plants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Indian-hemp</li> <li>2. Canyon Maple</li> <li>3. Butterfly weed</li> <li>4. Cutleaf Comflower</li> <li>5. Paper Birch</li> <li>6. Snow-on-the-mountain</li> <li>7. Buffalo currant</li> </ol> <p>With these three topics there are 238 endangered mammals, 742 endangered birds, and 371 endangered plants (plants are just in the Rocky Mountains) recorded. How many of these animals are you going to kill especially when your building through two of our national forest?</p> <p>I understand that you have many alternatives to this project, but you do not have one that is good for all the things that are being looked at. For example the AGS may be good for safety but is it good for bringing down pollution, the animals, plants, energy, and all the other things your looking at. The best alternative for endangered plants and animals is the dual or diesel bus. But once again it's not good for everything you are trying to watch out for.</p>	Online

Some people may think that there are more important things than animals like money, pollution, and many other things. My opinion is that animals make up this environment, and we need each and every plant on this planet to survive! Like I said before we are trying to protect these endangered plants and animals so they do not die off.

The diesel or dual bus alternative may be best but how much will it cost the community? What if we do not have the money to afford these options? People are not just thinking about what's going to be harmed in the environment they are more concerned in if they can still afford everything they need. Like their kids and them!

All in all what I am trying to say is if we want to change this community for the best we need to have an option we can afford and that will protect all the thing we are worried about. Such as the plants, animals, pollution, safety, and so on and so forth. Thank you for taking the time to hear out my opinion. I hope you think a little harder about you decisions to changing our state and many others to come.

Categorized Comment	402	Sugar, Matt	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/26/2005	I am the director of communications for Intrawest Colorado. And we are very concerned about the ongoing problems with I-70. We would like to see another lane sooner rather than later. And we would like to keep the option for a monorail intact or some sort of mass transit. We'd like to keep that option for the future.  We are very concerned because we're such a big part of Colorado's economy that I-70 is in a position now where it's starting to keep people away from our second largest economy, which is travel and tourism. So we would like CDOT to move sooner rather than later on another lane in the corridor. It affects Winter Park and Copper Mountain as well as numerous ski areas in the central mountains and Western Colorado.  I think that's all I'm going to say right now. We're going to submit more statements, probably more written, but I wanted to get that out today. Because I didn't want to stand up in front of everybody.	Transcripts
---------------------	-----	-------------	--	-----------	---	-------------

Categorized Comment	415	Sugar, Matt	Public	2/26/2005	Let me preface this by saying that I'm grateful for the extra time that we have to comment on this, and Intrawest, who I work for, will be submitting some comments in great detail as we consult within our company and within our community to come back and offer hopefully valuable information of where we are on this project.  So, with that preface, one thing I would like to say -- there's several things, but there seems to be a bit of bashing going on here. I don't know that that's all that constructive. I've worked on both sides of this issue for different entities, including working for the State of Colorado. I've got to say that there's an enormous amount of work that you should congratulate yourselves on bringing all this information to all these people.  And there are people from Clear Creek County here. I live in Grand County. I've lived in Lakewood. I had a job working for the state that took me to every community in Colorado, and I've seen these conflicts and these controversies and difficulties throughout the state. And I got to say that I think you guys have done a superb job.  I've been coming to these meetings for over three years now, at least some of them. I think you've done a superb job at coming up with valuable information which people can make judgments. You have a very difficult job, and it's -- you can see that by the devices in this room and other meetings that I've been to.  I admire you for taking this on, and it's something that the State of Colorado really needs to grapple with and understand. And I think that you've provided the information, yet nobody's always going to agree, but you've provided the information for the debate and that's -- I pat you on the back for that one.  With the I-70 situation, we know that it has to change. It has to change somehow. In a perfect world, we would have some other mechanism, some other way to travel throughout this beautiful state by the people who live here and by the people who come here and visit. Unfortunately, we don't have that technology or that availability to us now, so you're -- we're all doing the best that we can. And I think you guys are too.  Again, I can't stress enough that I admire the information that you've put forward and the work that has gone into this. And I understand that -- seeing how this has to come together and all the different criteria, whether it be environmental and whether it's population or economy, that you have to throw into the mix, I think that it's important for everybody to take -- and many of you have spent half a lifetime on these issues, and I know that many of you sitting at the table have too.  And, you know, I hope that we can all get to a point where we reach somewhere in between where we can make this I-70 corridor work. It's huge for the economy here in Colorado. It's huge to us here in Winter Park, Winter Park Resort, Copper Mountain Resort, our sister resort, and the tourism business in Colorado, which is the second largest industry in the state.  And we have to pay attention to that, whether we live in Lamar or whether we live in Craig. And if we're not on the corridor, that all has an impact. So again, I want to thank you for taking the time to do this.  Again, we will have a more detailed -- submit something in writing that has more detail. And, again, one person can't know all this. So I think we're going to consult within our company, within our communities, and we'll come back to you with hopefully good information and give comment on all the work that you've done. And we're looking forward to the process.  Thank you.	Transcripts
---------------------	-----	-------------	--------	-----------	--	-------------

Categorized Comment	669	Svensson, Einar	Public	5/16/2005	May 16, 2005  Chris Paulsen, Deputy Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011 Tel: 303 757-9156  Re: Proposal of Alternative Transportation for the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft, Colorado, PEIS applying the SemiMaglev™ Urbanaut® Monorail technology.  Dear Chris Paulsen:  The Urbanaut® Company Inc. has, with interest, followed the large number of professional studies and many public hearings on the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS.  We have had communication with several professionals within CDOT and many individuals who have encouraged us to request a professional evaluation of the SemiMaglev™ Urbanaut® Monorail as an alternative technology for a portion or for the entire I-70 Mountain Corridor.  We understand that the review period for such a submittal has been extended to May 24, 2005 in Colorado.  We are herewith enclosing: 1. A CD with a comprehensive Power Point Presentation (PPP) of 80 slides illustrating the SemiMaglev™ Urbanaut® Monorail, A Total Monorail Project, as an alternative technology for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. With respect to the SemiMaglev™ concept, the PPP describes how our technology applies Urbanaut® bogies with rubber tires or solid wheels independently or in combination with application to several options of the Urbanaut® Maglev technology.  The PPP is backed up by thousands of proprietary documents related to design, engineering, manufacturing, testing and construction of factual projects on monorail and maglev installation.  2. An index for the Power Point Presentation is enclosed with this letter. 2 pgs.  3. "Basic information on the Urbanaut® Monorail Applying Bogies of Rubber Tires / Solid Wheel Bogies". 1 pg  In addition the following are references to information on the Urbanaut® Monorail Technology, applications, including costs that are on our web site urbanaut.com.  1. "The SemiMaglev™ Urbanaut® - A New Total Monorail Concept", a presentation by Urbanaut published in the Maglev 2004 Proceedings, Oct. 26-28, 2004 in Shanghai, China. (This paper is also available for review on our web site.) The Urbanaut® Co., Inc. attended this international maglev conference with a display model vehicle and bogies of several maglev alternatives.  2. "Puget Sound Regional Urbanaut® Monorail Master Plan" (PSRMP). This document is also on our web site. It is a recent proposal for 100 miles of SemiMaglev™ Urbanaut® Monorails with a dual guideway trunk line, including costs for the Puget Sound Region, Washington State. In addition the Master Plan shows how an independent Urbanaut® Circulator through the City of Shoreline, WA, a suburb north of Seattle, can integrate directly with the PSRMP trunk line.  3. A recommendation by the large international transportation consultant, Bucher, Willis and Ratiff	Written
---------------------	-----	-----------------	--------	-----------	--	---------

(BWR) of Houston, Texas that the Urbanaut® technology be used for the planned 520 floating bridge crossing Lake Washington in Seattle, WA, and for the high density east side of Lake Washington. A light rail alternative was not recommended. (See urbanaut.com)

Mr. Einar Svensson, President of the Urbanaut® Company, Inc. is a licensed professional civil engineer in the State of Colorado, a world authority on monorails and an international cross country ski coach and World Masters Champion skier. He is familiar with the varied complex problems of severe weather conditions and terrain variations and the challenge involved in design, engineering, construction and operation of an Urbanaut® Monorail for the I-70 Corridor. You will find other biographical information on the 2 principals and owners of the Urbanaut® Co., Inc. in the Power Point Presentation (Item 1 enclosed).

We would like to stress that the Urbanaut® Technology is a totally different monorail technology in virtually all aspects (theoretical, practical, economical and adaptability) in comparison with the monorail portrayed by CIFGA which primarily was centered around an untested Seraphim motor (which proposal was rejected by CDOT). We believe it would be unwarranted and unjust to refer to the CIFGA monorail technology in any comparison with the SemiMaglev™ Urbanaut®.

Recommendation for further study of the Urbanaut technology:

This proposal by The Urbanaut® Co. Inc. suggests CDOT and other agencies involved should evaluate the Urbanaut® as an alternative transportation technology for the I-70 Corridor, including costs. An independent detailed study would be needed to apply the alternative for the I-70 Corridor, a scope that is beyond what the Urbanaut® Company would finance and conduct at this time. The following team is recommended for such a study:

1. Einar Svensson, Consulting Civil, Structural and Transportation Engineering with a professional engineering license in Colorado could be partner in such a study. He is recognized as a world authority on all aspects of monorails.
2. Dr. Stephen Kuznetsov of Power Superconductor Application Corp (PSAC), 930 Cass Street, New Castle, PA 161-1-5241. Dr. Kuznetsov is an authority on maglev engineering and his company, PSCA, has done extensive maglev engineering for Urbanaut®, and will test and manufacture Urbanaut maglev and propulsion equipment.
3. SNC-Lavalin, Suite 1800-1075 Georgia St., Vancouver, BC, V6E 3C9, Canada. SNELavain is a recognized worldwide consultant and contractor on light rail transportation applying LIM propulsion and they do have monorail experience. Mr. Svensson inspected their recent work on the Seattle Alweg Monorail. The SNC-Lavalin director in China, Mr. Sheldon Xie, is involved in an Urbanaut® Monorail planned in China.
4. A local Colorado consultant, selected by CDOT.

We have been in communication with one of the largest contractors in Colorado and the Northwest that has expressed interest in bidding on the large variety of Urbanaut type construction involved for the I-70 Corridor.

For the rolling stock, an experienced company in Seattle, Pacifica Corporation (President Bill Patz), has done extensive study and cost analysis for manufacturing the Urbanaut® vehicles. Urbanaut has an agreement with a large international rail manufacturing company, Rotem inc. of South Korea, who will bid on the Urbanaut rolling stock for the I-70 Corridor. Rotem has tested a maglev vehicle very similar to the HSST-100 of Japan. Rotem also delivered light rail vehicles for the Athens, Greece Olympics, 2002.

TTC Transportation Test Center in Pueblo, Colorado has expressed interest in building a test track and do testing services for us. (Only a 1.2 meter (4.0 ft) wide slab is needed for a surface guideway testing facility).

Urbanaut Technology Center

Urbanaut has a comprehensive plan for a Technology Center entailing 1.0 miles (1.6 km) of a figure eight shaped elevated and surface guideways, incorporating several types of inexpensive switching devices, a building with a control and testing center, maintenance and training facility for management and servicing of planned factual Urbanaut installations.

Flexibility — Guideways — At surface, subsurface or elevated

The environmental impact of the SemiMaglev™ Urbanaut® Monorail will be the smallest by a large margin at surface, subsurface and aerial of any comparable transit. A surface guideway will have subsurface or elevated crossings of the guideways where needed.

For a long corridor, like I-70 in Colorado, emphasis should be made on an inexpensive Urbanaut® surface guideway since such cost may be 1/3 of an elevated guideway. The civil infrastructure (fixed portion) is approximately 2/3 of the total project cost (see Power Point Slides #60 and 65). Planning of the guideway, station locations, option of guideway location (in center or the side of the highway) are all effected by the variable in the cost. A comparison of energy cost O&M is shown on Slides 70 and 71.

Because of the severe winter climate, the surface guideway is recommended as a closed shallow insulated box, with inside heating of the runway, which should be relatively inexpensive.

With such a large project as the I-70 Corridor PEIS, the selection of the Urbanaut technology may emerge as a new industry that could be centered in Colorado and employ thousands of people. There is a tremendous demand world wide for a technology like the Urbanaut®. We have received more than 100 inquiries world wide for factual projects, and an independent study suggests that the Urbanaut technology is a potential trillion dollar industry.

For a presentation, we have a large display of 1:10 scale vehicles with operational bogies and models of elevated guideways and a demonstration of simple automatic high speed switching, and a proprietary interactive CD of special features of the Urbanaut technology.

We would appreciate your acknowledging the receipt of this proposal.

Very truly yours,  
Einar Svensson President  
The Urbanaut® Company, Inc.

Cc: John Svensson

Encl  
CD with a comprehensive Power Point Presentation (PPP) of 80 slides illustrating the SemiMaglev™ Urbanaut® Monorail  
Index for the Power Point Presentation  
\*Basic Information on the Urbanaut® Monorail Applying Rubber Tire / Solid Wheel Bogies\*

Categorized Comment	792	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8	Federal Agencies	6/13/2005	UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 8 999 18TH STREET- SUITE 300 DENVER, CO 80202-2466 Phone 800-227-8917 http://www.epa.gov/region08	Written
					June 13, 2005	
					Ref: BEPR-N	
					Jeffrey R. Kullman Regional Transportation Director CDOT Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011	
					David Nicol Division Administrator, Colorado Division, FHWA 12300 W. Dakota Ave. Suite 180 Lakewood, CO 80228	
					Re: EPA Detailed Comments on the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement CEQ # 040554	
					Dear Messrs. Kullman and Nicol:	
					The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, has reviewed the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PDEIS) for the I-70 Mountain Corridor transportation project. These comments are in addition to our comments sent to you on May 24, 2005, and are also provided in accordance with our authorities pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4231, Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Please refer to the May 24, 2005 comments for our major comments. The rating for this document is also in that letter.	
					We value the way in which CDOT and FHWA have responded to our comments in the past, and are impressed with the breadth of knowledge CDOT, FHWA, and their consultants have on this project. We do believe, however, that this document has so much information it is hard for the public to grasp the	

important issues and hard to review. If you have any questions on these comments, please contact me at 303 312-6004, or Deborah Lebow of my staff at 303 312-6223. We look forward to working together with you on these comments and future projects on the I-70 corridor.

Sincerely,

Larry Svoboda  
Director, NEPA Program  
Ecosystems Protection and Remediation

cc: Chris Paulsen, CDOT Region 1  
Monica Pavlik, FHWA Colorado Division  
Jean Wallace, FHWA Colorado Division  
Tim Carey, US Corps of Engineers  
Connie Young-Dobovsky, US FWS

EPA'S DETAILED COMMENTS  
I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Draft EIS

#### NEPA CONCERNS

##### PURPOSE AND NEED

Purpose and Need Statement (Page ES-1): The underlying need for the project is stated as increased capacity, improved accessibility and mobility, and decreased congestion. The need really seems to be to reduce congestion, particularly during weekends when demand is high, summer and winter. Including increased capacity in the need statement could exclude some opportunities for management options to reduce demand. The document should clarify that the purpose and need as written is not intended to exclude alternatives that increase capacity by decreasing the need or the vehicle miles traveled.

Level of Success Criteria: The project purpose discussion does not provide any criteria against which the success of any specific alternative in reducing peak period congestion can be evaluated. In other words, what level of congestion is unacceptable and why, and how does each alternative attain an acceptable level of congestion? In addition, we believe the purpose and need should be restated to address the time frame that the alternative must address.

##### Explanation of Terms (Section 1.5.4):

The document suggests that slow moving vehicles (Trucks and RVs) are equal in performance to several passenger cars. We are not sure what this means and why the analysis was done this way.

Section 1.6.2: The definition of "Truck/RV external" includes automobiles from external locations in the calculation of the number of person trips. If the Truck/RV external is also presumed to be slow moving vehicles, this would overestimate, (perhaps greatly) the number of actual slow moving vehicles and overestimate congestion values.

#### ALTERNATIVES

##### Determining Preferred Alternatives:

Baseline Travel Demand Numbers: The preferred alternatives are defined as those that best meet the "underlying need" – the ability to meet a minimum of the 2025 baseline travel demand projections and that are reasonable from an economic affordability point of view, and still accommodate the items described under the purpose on page ES-1 (environmental sensitivity, community values, safety, technical feasibility and affordability). We are concerned that the baseline to determine whether these alternatives meet the need is the demand without any suppression, a large and perhaps over-stated number. The alternatives are all then geared to these large numbers in determining when they will be at network capacity. The Final EIS should explain why this worst case scenario is reasonable and why designing for the large, unconstrained demand numbers makes sense.

Amount of funding: The amount of funding committed by The Transportation Commission and available over the next 20 years is \$1.6 Billion for this corridor (see pages ES-2 and 5-11), but the cut-off for choosing preferred alternatives is set at \$4 billion in case additional funds become available. The underlying basis for the \$4 billion is not set out in sufficient detail in the draft. If this is a significant basis for choosing preferred alternatives, there should be better information on the selection of the \$4 billion as the cut-off.

No Action: The document states on page 1-17 that "no improvement would be made to the transportation network under the No Action and Minimal Action alternatives." This does not seem to be the case when the alternatives are described, and we suggest this be changed to reflect the fact that changes to the transportation network that would be made without this project are considered in the analysis.

##### Minimal Action Alternative:

The minimal action alternative includes some transportation management, interchange modifications, auxiliary lanes, curve safety modifications, sediment control programs, and high frequency bus service in mixed traffic. The minimal action alternative is designed to more fully maximize the capacity of existing I-70 without major improvements. We suggest that the Minimal Action Alternative is not as inclusive as it should be, and not enough money is allotted to the transportation demand options to allow this alternative to be comparable to other alternatives. As analyzed, this alternative would cost \$1.31 billion, with the bulk of that cost for construction portions. The amount allotted to travel demand management is \$104 million, and this aspect of the alternative does not appear to have been modeled to determine how it might reduce demand. The minimal action alternative may meet the purpose and need if designed to reduce congestion.

The document states that the minimal action alternative is not a stand-alone alternative because it would not accommodate the Baseline 2025 demand. Given that "accommodating" demand, which is how the purpose and need statement is worded, does not necessarily mean satisfying all the demand, and given the fragile mountain ecosystem that this project runs through, we believe that the minimal action alternative could be a stand-alone alternative, and could include additional transportation management opportunities to adequately compare it to the other alternatives. The estimate of travel demand shows that a significant component of the demand is recreational non-work days and overnight winter and summer weekends. The minimal action alternative could include innovative incentives to reduce the transportation demand from the recreating public during these peak periods. These ideas could be far less expensive than the build alternatives suggested.

The following transportation management ideas are included in the Minimal Action Alternative (see page 2-8): Ramp metering; Slow-moving vehicle plan; Peak spreading incentives (but no specifics on what these might be); Rideshare parking lots; Enhanced traveler information; Mountain Corridor Parking Operations Plan; Buses in mixed traffic; and Frontage Roads in Clear Creek.

It is worth noting that CEQ guidance states that a lead agency must look at all reasonable alternatives, including those outside their jurisdiction and those with a potential conflict with local or federal law (see 40 CFR 1502.14(c) and CEQ 40 Questions, question #2b). Research by the Transportation Research Board indicates that congestion pricing is the most effective means of significantly reducing congestion (e.g., variable priced roads), and these should be taken into account. Changes in the law to allow I-70 to be a toll road during peak periods only (with exceptions for residents) could be considered as part of the minimal action alternative. In addition to congestion pricing, the following are examples of ideas that could be considered and analyzed before the minimal action alternative is eliminated as a stand-alone alternative: Expanded car pooling or van pooling to destinations with significant funding incentives; free bus passes or taxi vouchers at end destinations; discounted rental cars at the end of a bus line; rebates for skiing at off-peak times; expanded and coordinated delivery services in the area; proximate commuting (i.e., job trading for those who can, to shorten commuting times); ride-matching programs; freight consolidation services; car-free options for those in the front range; heavily subsidized bus rapid transit; limited truck traffic during peak hours. Many of these are cost effective compared to build alternatives, and could build momentum for use as conditions become more congested.

In addition, we do not believe that the minimal action alternative, as analyzed in the DPES, adequately addresses some of the pinch points where congestion occurs. An explanation of why this was not considered should be included in the document.

##### Reversible/HOVH/VOT Lanes Alternative

This alternative appears to be limited by the inclusion of only two entrance points for reversible lanes (see page 2-48). By designing only two entrance points, this alternative most likely will provide limited benefit to the local traveling public and therefore limits the appeal. As with the minimal action alternative, it does not appear that this alternative was given sufficient design to be comparable to other alternatives.

##### Comparison of Alternatives:

As indicated in the DPES, CDOT and FHWA have not decided whether the project should accommodate short or long-term transportation needs. Until this is clarified, it is difficult to identify the environmentally-preferred alternative. The document shows that in order to meet short-term demand, generally, the dual-mode bus in guideway alternative appears to have the fewest environmental impacts. The bus in guideway alternatives also provide some of the goals that the communities along the corridor have suggested that they want – cleaner air, less noise, and a high-speed alternative. The bus in guideway alternative also has improved energy efficiency (as compared to the diesel bus in guideway), lower construction impacts, operational flexibility, and perhaps more local access. For some resources, the rail alternatives appear to have fewer impacts. The document appears to show that the minimal action alternative may also be environmentally preferred, particularly if travel management options are enhanced and analyzed. A longer-term solution will have additional impacts, but otherwise may be appropriate, depending on the purpose of this project. However, based on the information provided, it is difficult to determine which of the longer-term alternatives may have the least significant environmental impacts considering all resources evaluated.

#### TIERING

FHWA regulations state that "For major transportation actions, the tiering of EISs...may be appropriate. The first tier EIS would focus on broad issues such as general location, mode choice, and area-wide air quality and land use implications...The second tier would address site-specific details on project impacts, costs, and mitigation measures." (See 23 CFR 771.111(g)). We believe this tier 1 document adequately addresses the broad issues such as general location, mode choice, area-wide air quality and land use implications. The level of analysis inherent in a tier 1 document, and in this document, gives a rough estimate of a comparison of environmental impacts such that we can compare modes in a fairly crude way, but makes it difficult to assess the environmentally-preferred alternative. Tier 2 documents should include a much more specific discussion of the environmental impacts and mitigation.

#### LOGICAL TERMINI

Many of the alternatives do not have the same termini – they are of different lengths in the corridor and end at different places. This makes it more difficult to review and compare alternatives. We understand that there may be legitimate reasons for different termini for alternatives – if they can still meet the need with a different terminus, and not result in segmentation. However, it is not apparent in the document what the reasons for the logical termini are for the different alternatives. This should be fleshed out in the final document.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

##### Air Quality

PM10: There appears to be no PM10 monitoring near the right-of-way (e.g., within several hundred feet) at any high volume/high congestion area. We suggest that monitoring be done both during and after construction. PM10 monitors at a number of locations in the counties in the corridor are mentioned, but it is unclear how they are relevant to the expected PM concentrations near the corridor. This information should be added. For example, information should be added on how close the monitor near Silverthorne is to major roadways, what the level of traffic is on those roads, the topographic and meteorologic conditions, and how those conditions might correlate to what could be expected near I-70. A map that shows the location and type (CO, PM) of the air monitors would be valuable.

- Section 3.13: Near roadway particulate monitoring in 1997 is discussed and it is mentioned that this monitoring took place only during storm events, specifically to monitor diesel truck emissions. It is noted that this is possibly a worst-case scenario. We suggest that this does not demonstrate the highest concentrations. It is likely that the worst-case scenario is 24 hours after a storm during high traffic congestion when the road begins to dry and sand and salt become re-entrained and airborne. This should be noted, changed, or discussed.

- Section 3.1.3.1: The PM10 hot spot qualitative analysis for project-level conformity in Jefferson County seems adequate. However, we suggest that the final EIS discuss whether the transportation network that was used in the referenced Denver PM10 Maintenance Plan analysis is the same as that in the alternatives being discussed here and whether further conformity assessment will be completed for the specific alternative and traffic scenario selected at a later date.

- Section 4.4: On page 4-9 it is stated that "PM10 concentrations in the corridor are low (16ug/m2) compared to the national standard of 150 ug/m2" and that "diesel emissions are the primary source of transportation emissions." It is not clear to us how this estimated concentration was derived. It appears that this may be an estimate of the annual average for the entire corridor. However, the 24-hour-average NAAQS for PM10 is 150 ug/m2 and the annual-average NAAQS is 50 ug/m2. The method used to derive the estimated concentration should be explained and the appropriate comparison made. It is not apparent to us that diesel would be the primary source of PM10. Generally, the primary source of PM10 associated with a highway corridor is re-entrained road dust. Please correct and/or clarify the source of these assertions.

- Section 4.4: On page 4-9, it is stated that the cumulative impacts from re-entrained dust would be considered minimal. Considering that these emissions are directly proportional to VMT, it is expected that emissions will increase greatly with traffic and VMT. Please explain why re-entrained road dust will not be a problem despite a large increase in total emissions associated with the increased VMT.

PM 2.5: PM2.5 is not discussed in Chapter 3: Affected Environment, nor Chapter 4: Environmental Consequences, but PM2.5 emissions are estimated in Appendix A, page A-34. Many small communities in the western United States similar to those along the I-70 mountain corridor have experienced PM 2.5 issues because of significant wood burning, temperature inversions and valley topography that all appear to contribute to PM 2.5 air pollution (e.g., Cache Valley, UT; Libby, MT). PM 2.5 pollution should be further assessed. In addition, PM 2.5 monitoring is expected both during and after construction.

Mobile Source Air Toxics: The paragraph on mobile source air toxics (MSATs) is insufficient. It is likely that the highway is the major source of MSAT emissions and overall toxic emissions would be lower compared to urban areas with similar highways. However, this corridor includes features such as narrow valleys, extremely high congestion episodes, high levels of VMT, residential and commercial growth, and receptors close to the highway that might cluster MSAT concentrations. Quantitative analysis of the emission trends of MSATs using EPA's Mobile 6.2 should be included to verify whether or not MSAT emissions are actually decreasing despite extremely large increases in traffic. In addition, diesel emissions such as locomotives or buses should be included in the MSAT analysis.

Level of Analysis: Some explanation should be given regarding the level of analysis in this Tier 1 document versus the future air quality analysis that will occur for the Tier II analysis as each piece of the project is developed.

Climate Change: Section 3.1: The document does not compare alternatives in terms of air emissions for climate change, despite the title of this section.

Construction Emissions: The document contains a limited assessment of construction emissions. Considering that construction on this project will likely last many years, the dust and diesel emissions associated with construction will be a serious issue for residents and businesses near construction zones. EPA suggests that CDOT commit to establishing air monitoring programs during construction along this corridor.

##### Water Quality

General comment: In this narrow corridor, it is difficult to sustain the natural environment and water quality. In our view, the three most important items to maintain or improve water quality in the corridor will be to minimize the footprint of the project, minimize the changes in hydrology (or mimic natural systems as much as possible), and reduce, minimize, or eliminate the impacts of winter maintenance activities.

Water quality and Superfund clean-up: The Upper Clear Creek basin water quality standards are on temporary modifications and will be reassessed during the next triennial review. The standards are on temporary modification while Superfund continues to remediate source areas or mine-waste piles. Since the last triennial review, numerous source areas have been remediated, reducing the metal loading to this section of Clear Creek. Consequently, surface water impacts from I-70 runoff may be more pronounced than before. In other words, as we clean up the Superfund metals, the highway metals become a larger proportion of the contamination. Increasing highway runoff while we are decreasing the Superfund contribution should be avoided. The Federal and State governments are spending over \$25 million on the Clear Creek/Central City NPL site. BMPs will have to be designed to prevent metals from highway runoff – deicers and other sources – from reaching the stream. It is our understanding that the metals from the mines and adits – copper, zinc, cadmium, arsenic, and lead – are the same as the metals associated with highway runoff. This needs to be addressed certainly in Tier 2 documents, if not in the final EIS.

Chemical Deicers: EPA is concerned about the long-term effects of chemical deicers along the I-70 corridor. Existing application rates of magnesium chloride are indicated as being 1,000,641 gallons per year, and alternatives for expansion of I-70 would call for an increase in usage of MgCl of up to 55%, resulting in a post-project usage of 1,550,994 gallons per year. MgCl-based deicers contain other ingredients and contaminants that can ultimately be transported into adjacent mountain streams. We have several concerns with this, as follows:

- The current model used (FHWA's Driscoll model) is a one-time picture of the water quality impacts from chemical deicers, and does not capture what will happen over time, nor does it capture cumulative impacts. We understand this is the best model available at this time, but its shortcomings should be noted in the document.

- Metals in deicers: The DEIS analyzes for dissolved copper and dissolved zinc. It mentions other metals in its discussion sections and in Appendix G states that deicer may contain small amounts of copper, lead, zinc, arsenic and cadmium. It also notes that in 2003 CDOT adopted specifications for MgCl deicer that restrict metals content significantly. Sampled MgCl-based deicers met the 2003 requirements for metals tested. Manganese was not measured in the CDOT study. The PDEIS should include more information on Manganese in deicer because it is subject to a temporary modification standard in Clear Creek's mainstem due to impairment. An updated statement on deicer metals contaminants would be helpful in determining potential contamination risks.

- Inorganics in deicers: The 2001 CDOT study on deicers identified ammonia and toxicity as potential problems for water quality. Current data verifying manufacturer compliance with the specified 5 mg/L limit for ammonia would be desirable. According to the CDOT study, even at 5 mg/L, ammonia could present a problem for water quality. Modeling results suggested that if roadway runoff exceeds a pH of 8.5, or perhaps slightly less, toxic ionized ammonia could be present in sufficiently high concentrations to cause impacts without further dilution.

- Water quality standards for Chloride: There are EPA criteria (guidance) for chloride (a chronic criteria of 230 mg/L for aquatic life, 250 mg/L for drinking water, and an acute criteria of 860 mg/L for aquatic life). The PDEIS states that undiluted highway runoff samples measured at 550 mg/L, with 720 mg/L as



an absolute maximum (i.e., concentration). The DPEIS cites chloride concentrations in Clear Creek during runoff events from 200 to 300 mg/L. The chloride levels from the highest sampling station in Clear Creek reached as high as 210 mg/L. If these elevated levels of chloride are indeed due to deicer (which is not clear in the document), a significant increase in deicer application due to this project could have a significant impact on water quality at those higher reaches. Exactly how much additional deicer use might be required in the highest areas of Clear Creek is not directly addressed in the document. Forecasts for additional deicer use are presented as basin-wide increases for each mode. It is hard from the information presented, to assess whether acute standards for chloride would be approached or exceeded. Some clarification of impacts in the Clear Creek area, the portion of the project that appears to be receiving the highest levels of deicer treatment corridor-wide, would be appropriate.

Appendix G states that chlorides can have adverse effects on terrestrial vegetation, especially to sensitive species such as conifers. It states that concentrations of 350 mg/L "can cause severe vegetation damage," and that damage to plants from 100 to as far as 650 feet from the roadway has been observed (CDOT's 2001 study). This may suggest deposition of airborne deicer on the more distant vegetation, with the deicer subject to less dilution. If road top concentrations are in the 720 mg/L range, airborne transport could present significant impacts. Where the streambed is close to the highway, this could pose significant impacts to water quality as well. Understanding the results of a study referenced in chapter 3 (Section 3.4, page 3, Peterson and Tratan ongoing CDOT study on the effects of deicers on roadside plant life) would be helpful before Final decisions are made.

Long-term effects of chemical deicers: We do not know the long-term and cumulative impacts of chemical deicers. Even a decade after CDOT adopted the use of MgCl solutions as a primary treatment of highway surfaces, the environmental impacts of these substances has not been fully evaluated. Such an analysis should specifically address the impacts and chemical makeup of corrosion inhibitors which are added to the MgCl and how these additives may affect the concentration of any listed pollutants and what effect organic corrosion inhibitors may have on levels of dissolved oxygen in adjacent waterbodies throughout the I-70 corridor. As part of the Tier 2 studies, more information should be provided to assess this issue.

On Page 3.4-26, an assumption is made that the bus in guideway alternatives would require more MgCl usage to ensure safe bus travel. The assumption is that because sand cannot be used in the guideway, increased use of MgCl would be required. There is no support for this assumption in the document. Is it possible that because the MgCl need only be applied on the guideway, and not on the whole width of the lane, as with the highway alternative, that the MgCl use would be the same as or less than a highway alternative, and not more?

Sediment: The long-term fate and transport of sediment should be further addressed in the Tier 2 evaluations. Current usage of traction sand listed as 76,050 tons per year along the entire project corridor and is anticipated to increase for all alternatives. This is of particular concern along Straight Creek and Black Gore Creek, where both waterbodies are listed as impaired due to sediments. The DPEIS does not provide assurance that the waterbodies will not be further impaired (i.e., a specific set of BMPs at particular areas should be developed and evaluated). As part of the Tier 2 evaluations, provisions should be included to ensure that at least 25% of the traction sand applied yearly to the I-70 roadway between the Blue River and the west portal of the Eisenhower tunnel can be effectively re-captured, to be consistent with an existing TMDL. Similar provisions should be addressed along the Black Gore Creek, where sediment impairments have been recognized but a TMDL not yet developed. The FEIS should include assurance that water bodies will not be further impaired in lieu of the specific BMPs to be included in Tier 2.

In addition, Straight Creek and Black Gore Creek are not the only creeks with current impacts from sanding. EPA work along upper Clear Creek and Ten-Mile Creek has shown sediment problems in these streams as well. Although sediment control plans are being developed (or have been implemented) in some reaches along I-70, the NEPA document should disclose the fact that ongoing sediment impacts from sanding operations continue to be a significant problem in the corridor and that the solutions being considered to date will only control a portion of the problem. They will not be 100% effective. (See page 3.6-12, Mitigation Measures)

Stormwater Permit: As stated above, the DPEIS does not provide certainty that impaired waters along the project corridor will not be further impaired, and that definite BMPs and/or mitigation measures will be included. Given the size and complexity of the project and the proximity of construction to several impaired water bodies, such an assurance cannot be given at this stage, and there is a strong concern that Colorado's general construction stormwater permit will not be appropriate for the construction activities proposed along the I-70 corridor. Pursuant to Section A.9. of the permit, an individual permit may be required for large projects and for projects which may contribute to a violation of water quality standards. It is the opinion of EPA that projects along the I-70 corridor should be handled under an individual permit which specifically addresses:

- Recommendations for staging construction along the project corridor to minimize the erosive potential of adjacent hillsides;
- BMPs for re-vegetating exposed and cut and fill slopes;
- Requirements for post-construction maintenance of roadways that minimize the transport of sediment and other pollutants associated with highway runoff (e.g., chemical deicers/Cu/Pb/Zn) during precipitation events;
- BMPs for recognizing, diverting, and potentially treating waters which have been exposed to historical mine wastes;
- Requirements for post-construction monitoring of stormwater runoff from management practices (e.g., detention basins) to ensure compliance with existing water quality standards and/or existing pollutant load allocations;
- Provisions to ensure compliance with existing TMDLs during and post-construction (e.g., 70% re-vegetation of cut-and-fill slopes and removal of at least 25% of the traction sand applied annually from the confluence of Straight Creek and the Blue River to the west portal of the Eisenhower tunnel – these numbers are from the TMDL); and
- Provisions to ensure compliance with water quality standards in areas where water quality standards have been exceeded but TMDLs have not yet been approved.

Accidents and Spills: Given the proximity of I-70 to several drinking water sources (54 drinking water entitles are identified within the DPEIS study area) and the fact that vehicle accidents and hazardous spills along the I-70 corridor have historically been concentrated in a select few areas (e.g., the 2-mile stretch along Black Gore Creek), the Tier 2 analyses should include further information about spill response and recovery within these accident-prone areas, and how water quality will be protected.

Waste  
Mitigation Measures and Contingency Plans for Spills: The document states that numerous impacts from regulated and hazardous materials would be common to all of the action alternatives (page 3.8-5). It continues on to state that actual direct impacts on these sites are unknown and information about them will be gathered and evaluated during future environmental studies. The mitigation measures stated in Section 3.8.5 will most likely be adequate, although they are not detailed enough for us to be certain. The Tier 2 documents should include greater detail on avoidance and mitigation of hazardous waste and mine sites. We suggest that the contingency plan for finding unidentified petroleum and hazardous substances, and other plans associated with hazardous spills and underground storage tanks, provisions for hazardous waste containment in case of a spill and a means of collection and treatment of storm water runoff in case of an accident, should be specifically explained in the Tier 2 documents.

CERCLA Priority Sites: Section 3.8.2.1: The DPEIS states that although numerous CERCLA priority sites are in the vicinity of Central City and Black Hawk, these sites are not in the Corridor area. This is not correct. The Big Five mine adit and waste rock pile are CERCLA priority sites and are within the CDOT I-70 corridor. The waste rock pile was remediated by CDPHE, and EPA is working with CDOT and CDPHE on remediation of the mine tunnel water and pond this year.

Road construction as a source of metal loading: Sections 3.4 and 3.8: these sections should consistently identify not just the historic mine waste as a source of metal loading, but also mineralized rocks exposed during highway construction. Currently, Section 3.8.2.6 discusses Acid Mine Drainage but not the highway road cuts as a source, but Table 3.4-15 identifies road construction as a source of metal loading into Clear Creek. The final EIS should assess the likelihood of road construction as a source of metal loadings as a problem, and section 3.4.4 should discuss specific mitigation measures to minimize or reduce metal loads from road construction that exposes mineralized zones. This should also be discussed in the Tier 2 documents with greater specificity.

Energy  
General comment: All of the alternatives with the exception of some aspects of the minimal action alternative, require a substantial amount of energy for construction, and "allow" more vehicle miles traveled (VMT), thereby increasing the energy requirements for operation. It should be noted that this bigger issue of additional energy requirements is not addressed in the DPEIS. Additional energy may be tied to additional air emissions, incremental global climate change, and national energy security issues. We would like CDOT to address these broader energy issues.

Costs included in construction costs: Section 3.18.2.1: The document states that the energy consumption for construction of transit was based on 10 terajoules per million dollars in construction costs, and there is some discussion of what is included in "construction costs." We want to make sure that mitigation and overhead costs are not included in these calculations. They may tend to skew the estimated energy usage upward.

Energy use by bus in guideway alternatives: Section 3.8-2: It is not clear why the dual-mode bus and diesel bus alternatives have operational energy use close to, if not exceeding, the operational energy use for a six-lane highway. Buses would be expected to be more energy efficient on a per person basis than automobiles. Please explain this apparent discrepancy in the FEIS. In addition, the total daily gas consumption numbers for dual mode and diesel bus in guideway in Table 3.18-2 are almost the same, but the total daily energy operations costs are quite different for the two modes. Please explain this apparent discrepancy.

Miles per Gallon Assumption: Section 3.18.2.2: We believe 22 mpg for vehicles using I-70 is optimistic. We would appreciate a better explanation, with data sources, to support this assumption.

Highway Energy Consumption Assumptions: Table 3.18-2: The total daily energy consumption for the six-lane highway 65 mph and 65 mph are the same. This seems questionable as we would expect that cars going 65 mph are more efficient than at 65 mph. Please explain.

#### Wetlands/Waters of the U.S.

404/NEPA Merger Process: A 404/NEPA merger process was used on this project, which we believe worked smoothly. The document describes some very good work done to avoid and minimize wetland and aquatic habitat.

Minimal Action as potentially the LEDPA: The document states that "while the Minimal Action alternative has been included for disclosure in the DPEIS, it does not meet the need for the project and, therefore is not considered a 'reasonable alternative' by NEPA criteria. As such, while the components of the Minimal Action alternative as a single mode may collectively result in the least damage to the aquatic resources, it should not be considered in the determination of the least damaging practicable alternative." (See Page 2-119) Because, as described above, we believe that the Minimal Action alternative has not been adequately evaluated, this premise may not be appropriate. If adequately analyzed, it may still be considered a practicable alternative under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Sensitivity Zone: A sensitivity zone of 15 feet on either side of the highway is used to address the indirect impacts to wetlands. We question whether this is enough to address the adjacent wetland hydrology, upland hydrology and habitat, and induced development. Please explain how the 15-foot zone was selected, and the criteria used to support the distance.

Definition of Practicable: The definition of "practicable" is found in the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, not in the CWA, as stated on page 2-118.

#### Social and Economic Values

##### Induced Growth:

The permanent population of the nine corridor counties was 172,726 in 2000. This population is expected to reach almost 350,000 in 2025, or more than double. The document predicts induced growth (that is, additional growth beyond what would be expected without the transportation project) for Summit and Eagle counties if any of the rail, bus, or highway alternatives are implemented. The document uses a statistical regression analysis to predict this (statistically significant past trends were projected into the future). This approach, while much better than many EISs we have seen, and certainly responsive to our requests for an assessment of the induced growth, is not an approach we are able to review. So, while we appreciate the work, it is not clear to us how the results were achieved. We do, however, acknowledge the work in this document on assessing the indirect impacts of growth in this project area.

Although the document does take the indirect or induced impacts of growth and translates them into impacts (on habitat, wetlands, water quality, water supply, and visual resources), the document does not look at ways to mitigate those impacts. This, we believe, is one of the purposes of a Tier 1 document – to look at big picture mitigation strategies. We suggest that the mitigation for these indirect impacts can include providing funding to local governments so that they may produce a plan that avoids, or reduces these impacts through zoning, land use planning, open space acquisition, etc. A plan could be developed that decreases the impacts of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) on air quality; increases open space translating into specific habitat and wildlife corridors preserved; addresses floodplain, wetland and riparian areas to be preserved or avoided thereby increasing water quality assurances; and addresses infrastructure and energy costs, which can be significantly reduced by appropriate planning.

We understand the difficulty of putting together the group of relevant entities and developing such plans in this geographic area. An entity such as the Northwest Council of Governments could be an appropriate body to oversee this type of work. We offer to help organize an effort to avoid or minimize additional impacts to environmental resources that may be caused by this transportation project. We suggest that the effort undertaken by EPA with Eagle County is an example of a first step in this process. EPA provided funds for Eagle County to develop environmental data layers so that relevant environmental information could be taken into account when local governments make land use decisions. We recognize that this type of work is outside CDOT or FHWA's jurisdiction and expertise, but what may be needed is a forum or leader, and funding, to help get this type of effort underway.

#### Environmental Justice

General Comment: We have three major comments on the Environmental Justice analysis in this document. First, the document does not appear to support the conclusion that low income and minority populations are not disproportionately impacted by this project. Second, it is not clear from the DEIS that efforts to achieve meaningful public involvement of all minority and low income communities were taken, particularly at the scoping phase of this project. And third, EPA Region 8's methods of determining low income and minority communities would have included more communities than the method used in this DEIS. These are all explained below:

Identification of Minority Populations: As you are aware, US EPA Region 8 considers any community or neighborhood with a minority population in excess of the state average an area that may merit additional attention as an environmental justice community. For Colorado, based on the 2000 U.S. Census, the state average is 25.5% minority. The chart at 3.11-2 shows that Carbondale's community is 32% Hispanic, and Silt is 84% Hispanic. The DEIS, however, states that "the minority populations are dispersed throughout the communities and that no single area within a community has a concentration of minority population." (See section 3.11-5.2, page 3.11-2) While we recognize that neither of these communities is directly impacted by I-70, they are indirectly impacted. In addition, we are concerned that there may be a minority population in this corridor that is not identified in this DEIS as such and that this minority population may not have been given an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process, especially for those who communicate predominantly in the Spanish language.

Identification of Low Income Populations: Table 3.11-8 identifies ten communities in the corridor where the low-income percentage exceeds the Colorado State average of 9.3% (using 2000 U.S. census data). We understand that CDOT uses a different method than EPA, and there is no one standard method that must be used. However, CDOT might want to consider giving additional consideration to the communities that CDOT has identified as low income, to be sure that these communities do not suffer disproportionate impacts.

Disproportionate Impacts: The DEIS states that "direct impacts on low-income and minority residents would be the same as for non-low-income and non-minority populations." This statement should be supported by additional documentation. The full extent of the low income and minority populations is not known, for reasons discussed above. Therefore, the document does not support this conclusion that impacts will be felt equally. It seems intuitive that the minority or low-income populations will live closer to I-70 in less expensive housing and will be impacted more from the noise and air quality impacts of some of the alternatives considered in this document.

We suggest that CDOT establish more rigorous procedures to engage the minority and low-income communities further during subsequent Tier 2 analysis, and ensure that for this tier 1 decision on mode, that low-income and minority populations have been sufficiently engaged in the process.

#### Vegetation and Wildlife

Wildlife/land use interface: Three identified wildlife issues with this project are wildlife barriers, animal/vehicle collisions and habitat. All of the alternatives raise some of these issues. The AGS alternative seems to be the best alternative for wildlife in terms of the barrier impact. The rail with IMS and bus in guideway transit modes seem to be impenetrable due to the fencing required. Highway options would also exacerbate an already significant barrier situation.

The document does not contain detailed information on integrating wildlife crossings and other structures designed to alleviate some of these issues with land management options. Without that connection, the wildlife crossings will not be as effective or successful. It might be useful to meet with one of the wildlife NGOs and wildlife agencies (FWS and DOW) to assess a strategy for dealing with the land use interface.

Bus in Guideway wildlife issues: Section 3.2.3.4: The document states that the Bus in Guideway alternatives would require two 3-foot-tall barriers topped with security fencing, which would be an impenetrable barrier for wildlife. There must be ways to incorporate wildlife crossings into this mode, and they should be considered since this alternative has fewer impacts, relative to other alternatives, on other environmental resources.

Additional wildlife analysis: The document does not evaluate wildlife mortality resulting from higher traffic levels, what the effect of habitat removal, reduced access to available habitat and habitat fragmentation will be on management indicator species or species of concern, effects on biodiversity, and some estimated reduction in impact from suggested mitigation. This should be done on a corridor-wide tier 1 level to ascertain the impacts on a broader scale, but if not done here, must be done in greater detail at the tier 2 stage.

#### Recreation Resources

Impact on Recreation Resources: Section 4.4.6 should discuss whether or not the alternatives would have a significant impact on recreation resources. If the USFS lacks resources to effectively maintain and manage activities and resources due to increased visitation, would this be considered a significant impact to the recreation resources? It is not clear whether the sustainability of the recreation resources was taken into account in attempting to meet this transportation need. A significant increase in population and day and non-work visitors to the area would be a major stress on the ecosystem in the National Forests and may not be adequately contemplated in the White River National Forest and Arapahoe Roosevelt National Forest comprehensive management plans. We question whether the project is attempting to accommodate more growth than is environmentally sustainable, and suggest a discussion on this topic between appropriate parties (e.g., USFS, EPA, USFWS, DOW, CDOT and

FHWA) before the final selection of an alternative.

Table 3.14-4: It is unclear why the combination alternatives will almost double the annual change in destination trips as compared to the sum of annual changes from "transit only" and "highway only" alternatives. Is there some synergistic effect of highway and transit together?

#### Cumulative Impacts

Chapter 4 on Cumulative Impacts includes informative maps and excellent information, and addresses the impact of this project in comparison to other projects and development in the area. However, it is hard to understand the actual cumulative impacts to resources because of the amount of information, and the fact that the document does not explain the impacts of the changes to the ecosystem. For example, section 4.4.2.1 states that existing development currently occupies approximately 9% of key deer habitats. The reasonably foreseeable development is expected to occupy 52% of key deer habitat. Songbird habitat is expected to rise from 3% to 24% in the watershed study area. Phosphorous loads to water quality are expected to rise 23% from existing conditions (see section 4.4.3.1). Phosphorous was used as an indicator chemical. This is all excellent information but we do not know what this actually means to the condition of water quality, to the deer and songbird populations, and to the ecosystem. The document should succinctly analyze some (not all) of the information presented to give us an indication of what is expected to happen to particular resources, based on all this information.

#### Mitigation

This document does not contain sufficient detail to allow us to determine how mitigation will be implemented for many resources, where it will be implemented, and whether it will be effective. We have made comments throughout this document that address appropriate mitigation at the Tier 1 level. We have several additional comments and concerns about leaving all definitive mitigation to Tier 1, as follows:

SCAP: The language in Section 3.19.2, item 6, infers some flexibility on mitigation measures. A Sedimentation Control Action Plan (SCAP) should be developed for upper Clear Creek, Straight Creek, and Black Gore Creek, not merely considered as stated.

Mitigation Summary for Water Resources: The summary of resource mitigation (table 3.19.1) denotes that BMPs, highway maintenance strategies, and drainage/sediment control structures will be implemented as appropriate to minimize impacts from winter maintenance. EPA believes that this commitment is understated and should be more rigorously explored. Specific mitigation plans should be developed to address these impacts. Currently, lack of funding is hampering efforts on Black Gore Creek, and this funding issue may be a significant concern for future mitigation of winter maintenance impacts.

Construction and Stream Disturbance Mitigation: (Table 3.19.1, Page 3.19-5): Mitigation measures include looking at impacts on areas that have already been disturbed by I-70 by using drop structures and re-vegetation of barren areas to improve stream health. EPA believes that additional site-specific mitigation should be considered for areas that have been indirectly affected by winter maintenance activities, including sediment laden wetlands and stream segments. Again, more specific commitments for mitigation projects may be necessary for NEPA and CWA compliance determinations.

Commitment to avoid fens: (Table 3.19.1, Page 3.19-6): CDOT is committed to avoiding fens through project planning at the Tier 2 level of study, and we commend CDOT for this commitment. However, included in this mitigation planning should be a FHWA/CDOT commitment at this Tier 1 level to avoid and minimize adverse impacts to fens from winter maintenance (sanding) and pushing/blowing snow containing sand off of the road prism. Without such assurances the document does not explain how fens will be protected in the future.

Categorized Comment	715	Taratus, Dennis	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>6-lane highway + build mass transit (cost to be determined)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>I would much prefer building alternate routes such as a new connection to route 285 extending into the Frisco-Breckenridge area, and also a new route to Winter Park eliminating most Winter Park traffic from I-70. If the only solution is I-70 do the most expensive alternate. DFTEBT69@aol.com 53 Lodge Pole Court Silverthorne, Co.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	324	Taylor, Jack	Public	2/12/2005	<p>Thank you. The first thing I want to do is thank CDOT for what you do for us all across the state of Colorado. And I think we have really been fortunate on the west slope to have the likes of Ed Fink and Bob Moston and Owen Leonard and those people over the years. And I will give you a hand.</p> <p>So those of us who travel the roads every day, we're probably thinking, Well, what's this guy talking about? But when you look back over -- and I traveled again today the north/south road. There has been a lot of work on 131, working on 13, working on 9. And what we are talking about here today is the I-70 corridor.</p> <p>And I have had the privilege of representing Eagle County for 12 years, and parts or all of Garfield County for that same amount of time. And I've been involved in a number of meetings with the I-70 corridor and the fixed guideway and all those types of things.</p> <p>And I have a vision that probably really stretches the scope of what you all are working on. But to have -- and I'm a fan of monorail or some type of rapid transit, people mover, that we can -- that would go all the way from DIA through downtown Denver, Union Station, and all the way to Grand Junction. And I guess -- and I think we have to look at that. And I think we have to look beyond even 50 years, maybe beyond that. I plan to live a few more years, but it is probably not going to happen in my lifetime. But we have to look at that and be able to move people somewhere down the future.</p> <p>And I was telling Ed earlier and some other people that I had a discussion with Tom Norton at the capitol. I don't know, a couple weeks ago. And I said, What I hear from Garfield County and Eagle County and western and northwest Colorado is that we never hear -- it seems like we never listened to. And I don't believe that entirely, but I do think there are some areas and I know that, Zack, some of your numbers scare the heck out of me. I know they are real numbers. But when you start talking about a six-hour trip to Denver, those things scare me. So I think that just makes me sit up straight and say, Hey, we've got to do something.</p> <p>And the big argument is where is the money going to come from? Well, I think we have to look at -- and some of you are going to say, Well, Taylor, there you go again, but I think we have to look at tolling and we have to clear some federal requirements of regulations that don't allow us to toll on existing roads because in effect we've already paid for those roads. But I think tolling is one of the keys to the financing of these types of things, whether we like it or not. Users pay. But -- and, you know, that's a scary thought.</p> <p>And some of you will probably tackle me before I get out of here -- and I plan to leave early because I have to get back to Steamboat. So I think we need to look at those types of things.</p> <p>And the other thing that I would suggest -- and the other thing that Norton told me is as it relates to monorails and that type of -- he said the technology's not there. Well, Ed talked about technology is there. You didn't get into it. I don't think, in your discussion. I was out making a phone call while you started. But maybe we can solve that problem, I think. And the money problem, we have to look at that too. And that's what Mr. Norton said, that we don't have the technology and where is the money going to come from. But he said, it's not off the table.</p> <p>So what I would suggest and request, perhaps, is that maybe a Tier 3 or whatever you call it, phase two, 3, 12, or whatever it is, to say, Hey, it is on the table at some point in time, and to look at it on a broader scale of the DIA through downtown Denver to Grand Junction. And why downtown Denver? That gets Denver in the loop, so to speak, to say, Hey, we have a play in this deal. But I think there would be a lot of people coming into DIA that would jump on a monorail. Isn't going to help us in Steamboat springs for a while. Maybe some spurs going off in phase 16 or whatever, who knows, but I think that's the kind of thing we have to look at. And, yes, it is probably going to require subsidies. But at any rate, that's kind of where I'm coming from. And I'll do everything I can to support a solution to this problem.</p> <p>And the last thing I can think of, I guess, that I haven't talked about, that was very clearly emphasized to me around Thanksgiving time when you had the big rock slide here in Glenwood Canyon is we have got to be looking at some kind of bypass route so people don't have to -- they are welcome to come through Steamboat Springs but they aren't happy to do that. They'd rather go up over Cottonwood Pass. And I've been over Cottonwood Pass in the summertime in a rainstorm and it is not fun. Lucky I had a four-wheel drive outfit and I got out of it.</p> <p>But I really think somewhere in this process, and maybe that's phase 13 or something, to give some consideration to an improvement over Cottonwood Pass, not just with the road, perhaps, but maybe with some kind of other people mover as well, because going through -- clearly I'm not an engineer so I have to be -- math and I are not that good of friends -- but to run that kind of thing through the canyon is tough.</p> <p>So maybe -- and I can -- I've been in Colorado since '69, and I can remember discussions about that was one of the routes that was considered, going up over Cottonwood with I-70. And I don't know if there is still in the archives somewhere that stuff to take a look at that, save some money, perhaps, and begin to take a look at that as an alternate route, not only for a road, but for other types of people movers as well on a long-range basis. So my thoughts for the day. Thanks for coming up here and</p>	Transcripts

					doing this. Appreciate it.	
Categorized Comment	77	Taylor, Lisa	Public	1/21/2005	My 2 cents worth	Online
					<p>We all know that the I-70 corridor from Denver to the Mountains is a congested mess, and things are not likely to get better any time soon. I would hope that the "powers that be" will be PRO-active in their thinking and not RE-active. Instead of looking at another lane of Highway perhaps you should think outside the box. What would really ease traffic along this stretch of road and continue to do so for years to come? In my opinion, another lane in 5 years will NOT cut it. By that time the traffic will be worse than it is now and by the time the construction is finished it will again be inadequate. We do not want to be another Los Angeles with more and bigger roads. We have the opportunity to create a better system, lets do it and not follow the status quo.</p> <p>Thank you for your time. Lisa Taylor Lisat@co.summit.co.us</p>	
Categorized Comment	109	Taylor, Marjorie	Public	1/19/2005	Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Marjorie Taylor, I live at 29999 Redlands Mesa Road. I live up Laroux Creek between Hotchkiss and Cedaredge.	Transcripts
					<p>I use the I-70 corridor as often as I can to visit my youngest child and oldest sister in Denver. I've used my pickup truck, the bus, the train and planes.</p> <p>I've been waiting for and tracking monorail development for six years, so I'm familiar with the issue. I want that monorail high-speed surface transportation ASAP to protect our local economy from years of CDOT-approved, inevitable building of bottlenecks on I-70.</p> <p>The monorail will be off the highway, and elevated, so as not to interfere with animal migration, besides protecting Colorado's unique Glenwood Canyon.</p> <p>Of course it's affordable, if CDOT gets out of the way. Why does CDOT treat the monorail as a public-funded transit system with a 20-year payback like other short-sided, one-time investments? This payback period is 75 years, not 20.</p> <p>The comparative guideway cost is 17 million per mile, much cheaper than two lanes of highway. And in capacity, it is equivalent to six lanes.</p> <p>Concerting all costs, why does CDOT say it is not affordable?</p> <p>We need a monorail authority in Colorado to attract CHSST, or the equivalent, to build it. The state and mostly federal public investments is the guideway. The towns buy their stations and private companies buy the cars, using our free enterprise system. The guideway authority leases time slots on the system to private carriers for operating revenue and to pay back capital costs.</p> <p>From a transportation policy viewpoint, I want the monorail to move back into the preferred category, and Tier 2 planning and deployment carried forward by a public purpose corporation, as was done for C-470, and the second stage planning must begin for the extension system into Grand Junction.</p> <p>I want to leave my heirs a new, more sustainable future, not a future choked with the last globs of asphalt that will deprive other roads all over the state or will require incredibly more expensive alternatives.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
Categorized Comment	673	US Department of Interior, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance	Federal Agencies	5/26/2005	United States Department of the Interior OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  Washington, DC 20240  ER 04/910  May 26 2005  Mr. David Nicol Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228  Dear Mr. Nicol:  This revises our comment letter to you dated May 19, 2005, on the Tier 1 Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation for I-70 Mountain Corridor, between Glenwood Springs and C-470, Garfield, Eagle, Summit, Clear Creek, and Jefferson Counties, Colorado. We ask that our May 19, 2005 letter be discarded.  General Comments  We acknowledge the extent of this project and appreciate the coordination conducted with Federal, state, and local agencies; the public; and Native American tribes. We recognize that various committees have been organized and tasked with certain components of the project, who have provided expert information and advice as you develop the project. We encourage continued coordination with these agencies and committees as needed throughout the remainder of the project.  We recognize that you have consulted with the Colorado State Historic Preservation Office, and will be meeting your Section 106 obligations through the preparation of a programmatic agreement in consultation with interested and affected parties. We also acknowledge that a programmatic agreement for tribal consultation is being prepared in consultation with affected Native American tribes. We support the use of programmatic agreements as a vehicle for meeting Section 106 and Native American consultation requirements.  Section 4(f) and 6(f) Comments  A total of 17 LWCF-funded projects in 5 counties are potentially affected, as outlined below. These LWCF-funded properties are located in or adjacent to the I-70 corridor between C-470 and Glenwood Springs which should be considered during the environmental analysis:  Denver County: • Grant # 08-00105, Denver Mountain Parks, City and County of Denver — Genesee Park portion • #08-00213, Genesee Park, City and County of Denver. • # 08-00379, Mountain Parks, City and County of Denver — Genesee Park portion  Clear Creek County: • #08-00470, Idaho Springs City Park, City of Idaho Springs • #08-00601, Georgetown Parks, City of Georgetown • #08-00965, Georgetown Lake, City of Georgetown  Summit County: • #08-00614, Dillon Park, City of Dillon • #08-00615, Greenbelt Park, City of Dillon • #08-00759, Summit Recreation Tourism Trails, Summit County • #08-00808, W. Walter Byron Memorial Park, City of Frisco • #08-00833, Rainbow Park, City of Silverthorne • #08-00891 Blue River Trail, City of Silverthorne  Eagle County: • #08-00827, Eagle River Park, City of Eagle • #08-01039, Dowd Junction Park Trail, City of Vail • #08-01074, Avon to Dowd Junction Trail, Eagle County Regional Transportation Authority  Garfield County: • #08-00012, Riverside Park, City of Glenwood Springs • #08-00996, Roaring Fork River Access, City of Glenwood Springs  We appreciate that you have analyzed avoidance alternatives in the Section 4(f) Evaluation, and are proposing a number of mitigation measures to minimize harm to Section 4(f) properties. Section 3.16.8 Properties Dismissed from Further 4(f) Evaluation is useful to the reader for understanding why some properties do not qualify for Section 4(f) analysis.  Without a Preferred Alternative selected, we cannot concur that there is no feasible or prudent alternative to the Preferred Alternative selected in the document, and that all measures have been taken to minimize harm to these resources. We understand that the Section 4(f) Evaluation will further be refined during the Tier 2 evaluation at which time avoidance alternatives and mitigation measures will be reevaluated. We look forward to reviewing the Tier 2 level Section 4(f) Evaluation.	Written

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document.

Sincerely,

Willie R. Taylor  
Director, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance

Categorized Comment	442	Temmler, William	Public	4/13/2005	Seek an alternative east/west corridor (i.e., from metro Denver to mountains)- for example, widen Hwy 85. This would benefit south metro to traffic to Summit County.	Form
Categorized Comment	344	Temple, Joe	Associations & Special Interest Groups	2/16/2005	<p>Joe Temple, the Lariat Loop Heritage Alliance. I just wanted to say that a piece of the I-70 corridor from the Evergreen exit to the Genesee interchange is on the Lariat Loop historic and scenic byway; it's Colorado's newest scenic byway. And we would like to explore the idea of creating an interpretive area off the interchange at Genesee.</p> <p>Currently there's a small park-n-ride that RTD owns of about 20 spaces. Across the street there's the buffalo enclosure. And then on the other side of the interchange, there's a big park-n-ride lot that CDOT owns. We'd like to explore the idea of moving RTD over to the bigger CDOT lot, and the RTD lot would become parking for our scenic overlook there at the buffalo enclosure. And it would overlook an interpretive spot as a gateway to the mountains, and it would discuss the Denver mountain park system and buffalo that people are looking at as it relates to the history of Colorado. So I would just like to pursue that concept with RTD and Denver Mountain Parks and CDOT to see what can be worked out.</p> <p>And I'd also like to sign in as another representative of another organization and comment differently.</p> <p>I'm Joe Temple with the Colorado Mobility Coalition. And I'd like to say that we support any transit alternative in the I-70 corridor.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	341	Teyf, Daniel	Public	2/16/2005	<p>I'm in favor of extending I-70. I think CDOT does a wonderful job, and I think I-70 is a major component to our state's infrastructure, including our economy.</p> <p>As far as environmental issues are concerned, the many times I've been stuck on I-70 in stop-and-go traffic, I've learned I use up three times as much gas. That means I also put in three times as much pollution. And, I think, if they expand the highway and allow the traffic to move more freely through the highway, I think our environmental issues are going to be improved.</p> <p>And I think it's going to definitely help our economy. Because, frankly, that is our economy. People come to our state to go skiing and to hit the mountains. It's also our portal -- for goods, for trucks, for -- I'm at a loss for words -- for our goods, infrastructure, whatever. You know what I'm talking about? Anything else? Yeah. We definitely need it.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	292	Todd, Grace	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Hi. I'm Grace Todd, and I live on Highway 103.</p> <p>I've listened to the demonstrations. I think they were very well done. But today's paper, the Denver Post, said that Denver wants to be the world's sports capital. And we're not going to achieve that kind of goal unless you do away with the automobile traffic, because there's no future in it. It's a polluter. It adds cement to the scenery, which we don't want.</p> <p>And I think these train illustrations and alternatives are the best. The AGS is beautiful. Of course, it's very costly, but I understand it's not as costly as we've been led to believe. I think we need to explore that option and keep in mind this is for the future and it's for the scenery and it's why we all live here. That's it.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	144	Todd, Grace	Public	2/8/2005	Looks like the ideal solution, but is there a working model of what is shown on the website or is the illustration a variation of other models? The concern is whether new technology is being used with problems still to be encountered?	Online
Categorized Comment	211	Todd, Grace	Public	2/9/2005	<p>The only long-term solution must be a "train" solution. Widening the highway is totally, absolutely unacceptable for the many reasons given at the Empire, CO meeting.</p> <p>If Denver wants to become a world class sports center, they must provide fast, efficient means of transportation to the mountain areas. They must also prove by their choice of mode of transportation, that they understand what "world class" means.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	722	Tracy, Emily	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion? 6-lane highway + space for future mass transit (cost to be determined)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>Transportation planning is a very long-range endeavor, so the elements to be included must see us far into the future. If there is to be a plan with any degree of success for the future of the I-70 corridor, it must reach far beyond a minimal action plan. Emily Tracy 153 Bucyrus Circle Breckenridge, Co 80424 tracyeaanon@cs.com</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	553	Trujillo, Shonna	Public	5/23/2005	<p>I think that CDOT should use the AGS because it is the best option. It will help the air pollution and the crowding on the I-70 road.</p> <p>One of the reasons why I think that CDOT should use AGS. This because it will help slowdown the air pollution that is going through our mountain corridor. The AGS doesn't use gas it runs off magnetic forces. It will also help the air pollution because there will be less cars on the road. Also because a lot of people will use it to get around.</p> <p>Another reason why I think that they should use the AGS is because there will be less traffic on I-70. I think this because it will go all along I-70 so people can get to where they need to go. Also because the tourists will want to ride on it to see what there is to see in our mountain corridor.</p> <p>The last reason I think that they should use the AGS is because of the future. One reason is because when I have kids I want them to see the mountains of Colorado. Another reason is because I go up to the mountains a lot and I don't want to get stuck in traffic for hours before I can actually do the things that I want to do. Also so that our mountains don't start looking like our city so that the animals and the people who live there can live in peace.</p> <p>Some people have arguments about the AGS. Using the AGS might not be the best idea because it will take a long time to build and it will not help the crowding that is in our I-70 corridor. It may take a long time to build but it's worth the wait because it will save our environment.</p> <p>The AGS is the best idea that they have come up for the changing on I-70 because it will help slowdown pollution and there will be less traffic and because it will help for the future because it will take less time to get to the mountains.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	217	Ufer, Jay	Public	2/23/2005	<p>The complexity, cost, constituency, consequences of the content in context is absolutely mind boggling.</p> <p>Please analyze the user group on the point of origin, point of destination, points intermittently, purpose of the trip, price, passenger volumes.</p> <p>I support</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Limit construction delays and construction timeliness</li> <li>2. Expand the highway to six lanes</li> <li>3. Preserve the mass transit solution corridor</li> </ol>	Form
Categorized Comment	439	Valenta, Mila	Public	2/23/2005	<p>CDOT has the opportunity now to be forward-thinking and innovative. Simply adding pavement will only feed congestion and make the "mountain experience" more of a "city experience." Why not raise money for a more forward-thinking and environmentally friendly plan with a variable toll? Tolls should be higher not only at peak times but for larger vehicles. Hummers and Navigators do much more damage to the roadway than smaller, lighter cars. The people that can afford to drive them can certainly afford more toll. Also, our environment must be considered. People are not the only animals who live here, and its far past time we considered water, animals, and flora in our discussions that affect them too.</p>	Form

Categorized Comment	51	Van Matre, William L	Public	1/18/2005	Using The Rail Lines Through Mountains	Online
					<p>When I was in Europe they had the rail systems setup so if you were traveling a long distance you could load your car or truck on a flat car and take a train. When you were at you destination they would un-load your car and have it for local use! Why don't you team up with the Union Pacific and set up this service! When I travel I go to Grand Junction a lot of the time and it would be great if I could do this!</p> <p>This would reduce some of the traffic!</p> <p>Bill Van Matre 190 Nugget Hill Rd. Jamestown, Co 80455</p> <p>Nuggethillrd@skyxpress.net</p>	
Categorized Comment	495	Venti, Bettina	Public	5/13/2005	Please move forward with researching this project. The potential benefits are far too numerous to mention. I support the project.	Online
					<p>Bettina B. Venti Vail, Colorado</p>	
Categorized Comment	350	Vermillion, Bob	Public	2/16/2005	My name is Bob Vermillion. I have a 24-acre private project between Kipling and Ward Road. It begins with a small six-acre lake that's adjacent to Ward Road.	Transcripts
					<p>We're supporting a highway development that's an elevated bus system. And in conjunction with that, we would like to promote a staging facility to accommodate such a system. And the reason we support the bus system is that it creates the flexibility that allows those buses to get off at every small town.</p> <p>And if somebody wants to go fishing, they get on the bus and go to small towns and the places they have booked have a pickup or a van or a station wagon waiting to take them to the fishing area. The same thing applies to the ski industry and the gaming industry. You have buses leaving every half hour. You have a very efficient program that -- where there's a counter and a booking facility.</p> <p>And I may need more than two minutes. And it -- they're able to -- in addition to the booking and counter facility, there's a coffee shop or a waiting room, quality restaurants, quality travel, and every mode of transportation, which includes the buses and vans and limousines.</p> <p>The facility would go further by having a child care facility. And it could go further by having a buffet where you would attract travelers coming off the freeway.</p> <p>It's long since been estimated that there are over 12 million tourists that travel I-70 West. That's 1.2 million every month. That's 4 million every day. And the majority of the tourists come in to see family, about 38 percent.</p> <p>The rest are coming in cars and traveling the majority of I-70 West. Having staging facilities that are in good destination locations will get the majority -- or get maybe 10 percent -- or even if it's 1 percent, that's 4 million a day -- and get them into buses and provide facilities where -- where our wives and our mothers who will no longer travel I-70 can conveniently get on a bus, go to the mall in Silverthorne and have lunch and come back.</p> <p>If you're interested, I'll give you more of the facilities. I'll give you how I think it should be paved and why I feel that the bus system is the only real alternative that gives the flexibility to encourage both town improvement and business improvement and satisfies the traffic on I-70.</p> <p>You want me to quit? Okay.</p>	
Categorized Comment	345	Vermillion, Bob	Public	2/16/2005	What we're doing starting in March is we're marketing for a hotel manager. We're developing -- we are not hoteliers. So we're sending this card out now marketing now for a hotel management and/or ownership joint venture for an improved 200-unit, fully serviced, graded, free and clear staging location with 50 limited-stay condominium suites. Show suites on-site -- with a show suite on-site. And we ask them to come by.	Transcripts
					<p>Ward Road, Kipling, they can actually drive by our site, see it and pull off and come back and drive by. It's a perfect arrangement for a tourist who doesn't know his way in town, because too many times we'll drive by a restaurant or a gas station and we can't get back to it. I mean, the freeway just keeps on going without letting him off. So we feel that we have a superior -- what we call a staging or a destination location.</p> <p>There are two things that -- there are two things that we're trying to do relative to the activities on I-70. One, we're building a hotel that's not relying on business. And most every hotel -- in fact, I don't know of any hotel that has been developed that doesn't rely on Denver metro business activities and have to be near office parks and places where businessmen congregate. This is more specifically designed for the tourist activity.</p> <p>And the surveys that we read, that there are 12 million tourists traveling I-70 west annually -- and that figure has gone up and up. It's beyond 12 million -- when you look at that, it's six times the metro population. And those tourists are heading for the mountains or the skiing and they want to get off. They get off in the summer -- winter for two things, for gas and food. And you have a very difficult time getting them off.</p> <p>So what we are trying to do with our lake here is trying to give them a reason to come off. And it could be something as simple as a billboard in Kearney, Nebraska, telling them to stop at the buffet at the hotel and get all you can eat for breakfast for 3.95 or get off for lunch and it's 6.95 or for dinner for 9.95.</p> <p>And -- and you're encouraging that guy like me when I see that sign. Well, let's don't stop here. Let's go a little bit farther and get that buffet. And when they get to the buffet, then you barter your wares. You offer coupons to go to the casinos. You offer them a map for horseback riding or rafting. You offer them a free bus ride to Trail Ridge Road or Estes Park. You do all kinds of things that will get them out of the car and into buses.</p> <p>And the hotel actually has seven lanes coming into the hotel. One lane is specifically designed for buses to come into a big circle drive in front of the Elks Hotel and go out. You could actually have six or eight buses there that could depart and unload and load, because right next to the lane they're in, there's an empty lane secured for buses that they come off of that park lane and get into that lane and leave.</p> <p>So that hotel becomes a place where, if they want to go to a football game or downtown and they want to go to skiing or gaming, they have a facility there that is not just for buses. It has a check-in counter, an information counter, adequate clean restrooms, a rest area or a coffee shop, a microphone system that tells them when things are coming and leaving, an efficient quality service for those people to depart from their car and get on a bus. And on the basis that it leaves every half hour, they don't have to sit and wait for an hour or longer for that bus.</p> <p>It also incorporates a child care clinic. And it's the type of clinic that kids want to know when they're going because they want to go back to that clinic. It's got a theater and video games and it has computers and art classes and a full-time nurse and doctor on call -- and it won't be cheap, but when they leave the kids there, they know they are going to be well taken care of. And they know they're going to have a good time while they are having a good time, maybe at the casino -- and at the casino they'll have a video room where mom can actually go up to the screen, call the kids up to the screen at the child care clinic and find out how they're doing or tell them that they're going to be a little bit longer.</p> <p>In addition to the transportation and child care clinic, it will have a buffet similar to the buffet that they have in the casinos: Quite elaborate, all the good foods, reasonably inexpensive. Because they're trying to use that buffet as a marketing tool to barter the wares that they have. They're trying to get these people to mountain buses and go places and spend money.</p> <p>The hotel is to become an extension of a casino, or a Vail resort as a ski area. We're hoping that we get either a casino or one of the major ski industries to be involved in managing and operating the hotel. And, on that basis, they will be able to incorporate that with their activities.</p> <p>The ski industry will have a place where people that have to get on an airplane at 8:00 -- rather than leave at 4:00 from Vail to bring them down to the hotel, and they get up, instead of 4:00, they maybe get up at 6 or even 7:00. And the same thing at night. If they come in late at night and they're going for the -- one of the very expensive condominiums at 6- or \$700 a night, they put them in one of the nice suites here and bus them up or van them up or limousine them up in the morning, and they can actually see the mountains and have a more safe ride during the daytime.</p> <p>The same thing applies with the casinos. But the other thing that we have taken care of is this facility right here. And this facility is close to being an information and travel center. And at some point in time we're going to be marketing that, and we'd like to get the hotel under-way first.</p> <p>But this white area in here is owned by the state. And on a three-story basis, it would allow about 300 cars to park. And you really need levels, because in the winter those people like to park their cars underground so they're not full of snow when they come back. So they're willing to pay more if you want to charge them for parking.</p> <p>But this facility here would be three levels. And somewhere between 5- and 7,000 square feet each floor. The main floor -- basement, main floor, and upper floor. The main floor would be in a -- would be a</p>	

series of booking booths that go around the facility.

And those booking booths are similar to the rental booths that you rent your car at the airport. And they would be managed by the major tourist companies like the ski slopes and like the chamber of commerces and the Division of Wildlife, and the Parks and Recreation, and Trail Ridge, Rocky Mountain National Park, and they would man those booths. But inside these booths, there's a large horseshoe. And every three feet there's a bench and then a shingle in front of that. This would be a counter, and on that shingle it would say, "horseback riding," it might say "Camping," "Fishing." These booths only being three feet wide, there might be as many as 35 or 40 vendors on this counter.

And, again, there might just be a rafting company and he has a shingle where his rafting company is at and what his prices are. And if it's horseback riding, the gal that's manning that booth would know the names of the horses and where the trails are. They would collect a deposit for the horseback riding trip, and she'd provide alternative transportation if they didn't want to drive. And then they'd pay the balance of their horseback riding trip when they end up at the stables. And that same thing would apply to rafting, to fishing, to camping, to -- all these girls would have the ability to --

Im going to quilt because the presentation is starting.

Categorized Comment	688	City and County of Denver, Department of Public Works	Municipalities	5/17/2005	City and County of Denver Department of Public Works Office of the Manager 201 W. Colorado Ave Dept. 608 Denver, Colorado 80202 Phone: (720) 865-8630	Written
<p>May 17, 2005</p> <p>Cecelia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Aurora, Colorado 80011</p> <p>Re: Comments on the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS</p> <p>Dear Ms Joy:</p> <p>The City and County of Denver has reviewed the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Tier I Draft PEIS). Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important and much needed project.</p> <p>Existing transportation congestion along I-70 is degrading the accessibility of mountain travel for Denver residents, tourists, and businesses. Travel demand in the corridor is projected to increase over the next 25 years and beyond, and congestion will impede economic growth within the corridor communities and the Denver metropolitan area. We applaud your efforts to find a cost-effective, appropriate solution to facilitate travel along this corridor.</p> <p>The following comments are provided in response to the December, 2004, CDOT request for comments on the Draft PETS for the I-70 Mountain Corridor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Denver supports a multi-modal solutions for the corridor, and encourages review of combination packages, i.e. both highway and transit. Clearly funding will be an issue, and construction may need to be phased, but at a minimum we need to ensure that highway solutions do not preclude transit improvements, or vice versa.</li> <li>• Denver also requests this assure an interface alignment with RTD's FasTracks plan. To do this, the corridor's eastern terminus should be at Denver International Airport (DIA) rather than at C-470 in Jefferson County. With the significant growth at DIA, rail transit system and the finalization of plans for the intermodal transportation center at the Denver Union Station (DUS) in downtown Denver, it is imperative that these hub facilities be connected by the most direct route, and that adequate capacity be ensured in the future.</li> <li>• Denver requests additional discussion and review of construction impacts and appropriate mitigation measures associated with CDOT's various preferred alternatives. The study should carefully look at the construction impacts of each alternative and determine whether or not there is a viable option for capacity in the I-70 Mountain Corridor during the construction phase. At present, the preferred alternatives' impacts, construction length, and the reduced mobility during the construction period are not clearly understood.</li> <li>• Finally, Denver encourages a longer planning horizon. Without a long term vision, we believe that the study will simply delay a real solution for another 20 years. The region must pursue a long term vision that provides a viable option to I-70 while improvements are made to the current highway facility.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you again for presenting us the opportunity to provide comments for I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS. If you have any questions, please contact Tony Ogboli at (720) 865-3157 or tony.ogboli@ci.denver.co.us. We look forward to continued collaboration with CDOT on this study.</p>						
<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Guillermo V. Vidal Public Works Manager</p> <p>CC: CDOT Tom Norton, Pam Hutton Denver: Amy Mueller, Bob Kochevar, Stuart Williams, Peter Baertlein, Dave Weaver, Tony Ogboli, Dave Ferrill</p>						
Categorized Comment	556	Vigil, Britney	Public	5/23/2005	<p>Dear CDOT,</p> <p>I have been working on surveys and research for what alternative is best for the I-70 corridor project. To me I feel that I-70 would do best if we used a monorail instead of extending the highway. There are many reasons why I feel that the monorail is the best alternative, and I hope that by the time that you are finished reading this letter, you will consider my reasoning for this alternative.</p> <p>With almost a full trimester of research, I noticed more and more reasons of why I feel that the monorail was the best choice. The monorail is using magnetic forces so therefore it doesn't release toxic chemicals through an exhaust pipe. Releasing toxic chemicals causes damage to the ozone. Little holes in the ozone layer let UV rays in, and that increases the chance of skin cancer. Other toxic chemicals that come from cars can also cause trees and plants to die making it more difficult for humans and animals to be able to survive in the environment.</p> <p>Using the monorail has other positive advantages as well. If we expand the highway then there would be more cars, and more cars, well people, waste money spending it on gas. If we had the monorail, all we would have to do is pay for the trip and we wont pollute the air. When the air is clean then our environment stays healthy.</p> <p>I did a lot of research, and I know that the monorail would be more expensive but in the future, and the corridor was extended, the population may well increase and we may have to extend the road even more. The more road we use the more land and historical buildings that we have to knock down. We would also be knocking down people's homes. I am pretty sure you own a nice home that you love and enjoy, why can't the people that live around I-70 enjoy their homes.</p> <p>During the research, I did get the understanding of why they would want to make a six-lane highway, but even if there is less traffic there is still a high possibility of people getting into car accidents. There is a chance that if there were more lanes more tourists would be able to come through, but if we expand the highway there would be nothing left but the highway. So, I just feel that the monorail would be the best choice.</p> <p>So, if you were to ask me for my opinion on what I think is the best alternative for I-70 corridor, I would say the monorail hands down. If we were to expand the highway, it would be very time consuming. Also if and when the highway gets finished, how do we know that the population maybe too big for the highway?</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	692	Greenberg and Traurig, Legal Counsel, on behalf of Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/17/2005	<p>Greenberg Traurig May 17, 2005</p> <p>Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011</p> <p>Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228</p> <p>Re: I-70 PEIS, Additional Comments for the Administrative Record Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation</p> <p>On behalf of the Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation, the undersigned of the law firm of</p>	Written

Greenberg Traurig, LLP, respectfully submits the following comments for inclusion in the administrative record for the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement & Section 4(f) Evaluation, December 2004 ("Draft PEIS"). Thank you for extending the comment period to participate in the process for the potential improvement of this important transportation corridor.

#### I. Draft PEIS Fails to Consider Health Impacts from Air Pollution

Fundamentally the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") requires agencies to evaluate environmental consequences of proposed actions that could cause significant environmental impacts. NEPA requires that the agencies take a "hard look" at the environmental consequences of proposed actions, both near and long-term. NEPA requires that federal agencies prepare an Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") for every "major Federal action[] significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." 42 U.S.C. § 4332 (2)(c); see 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4370f. "Human environment" is interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.14. The statute mandates that an EIS examine: (1) the environmental impacts of the proposed action; (2) the adverse environmental effects of the action that cannot be avoided; (3) alternatives to the proposed action; (4) the relationship between local, short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and (5) any irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources that would be involved. 42 U.S.C. § 4332 (2)(c). In other words, Federal Agencies must take a "hard look" at the environmental consequences of such a major federal action before taking that action. *Baltimore Gas & Elec. Co. v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 462 U.S. 87, 97, 103 S.Ct. 2246, 76 L.Ed.2d 437 (1983). "To comport with this standard, an agency must prepare a 'detailed statement'...from which a court can determine whether the agency has made a good faith effort to consider the values NEPA seeks to protect." *Minnesota Pub. Interest Research Group v. Butz*, 541 F.2d 1292, 1299 (8th Cir. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 922, 97 S.Ct. 1340, 51 L.Ed.2d 601 (1977).

The central requirement of the [NEPA] statute is procedural. It does not mandate particular results. But it does require that agencies considering major federal actions that will significantly affect the human environment go through a thorough process. All of the considerations, including environmental ones, that lead to the agency's decision are to be thoroughly explored and exposed to the scrutiny of the Congress and the public.

*City of Bridgeton v. FAA*, 212 F.3d 448, 464 (8th Cir. 2000) dissent, Judge Arnold).

Here, the PEIS is used to make a determination regarding transit and non-transit alternatives without the requisite and appropriate analysis of impacts. See *California v. Block*, 690 F.2d 753, 765 (9th Cir. 1982). When a large project is proposed, the agencies "may not rely upon... the task's magnitude to excuse the absence of a reasonably thorough site-specific analysis of the decision's environmental consequences." *Id.* citing *Environmental Defense Fund v. Andrus*, 596 F.2d 848, 851-52 (9th Cir. 1979).

As you know, "tiering" deals with the relationship of programmatic and site-specific NEPA documents. This mechanism allows agencies to incorporate information contained in programmatic documents by referring to them in later site-specific NEPA documents. Nevertheless, tiering is not a means to avoid issues. It is not appropriate at the Tier 1 level to ignore environmental sensitivity for the selection of a preferred alternative. The Draft PEIS fails to consider the costs of adverse health effects including air pollution pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 109. It also attempts to make a determination regarding transit and non-transit alternatives without the requisite level of NEPA analysis despite significant differences in concentrations of air pollutants among the alternatives studied.

While Section 3.1 sets forth alternative comparisons regarding National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), it does not include any comparative discussion or analysis of health impacts among the alternatives. With respect to Carbon Monoxide emissions for example, the "Transit alternatives would be approximately 2 percent to 6 percent lower than those of the No Action Alternative." Draft PEIS at Section 3.1.3.1. In contrast, "the Six-Lane Highway (55 or 65 mph) alternatives would result in emissions approximately 13 percent higher than those of the No-Action alternative. The Reversible/HOV/HOT alternatives have the highest CO emissions in 2025 (approximately 29 percent higher than those of the No Action alternative) as a result of higher traffic volumes during peak hours." *Id.* (The percentage spreads for PM10 are similar.) In conclusion, the percentage spread between the Transit alternatives and the Reversible/HOV/HOT alternative is a significant and a remarkable 35 percent, yet the health costs from such spread are not evaluated.

If the agencies considered health costs, they may well find that the Six-Lane Highway alternatives and the Reversible/HOV/HOT alternatives are "economically infeasible." Furthermore, if the reduced health costs associated with the transit alternatives are credited toward the cost of the Transit alternatives, including the AGS, then such alternatives would be relatively more economic. Notably, the Cost Comparison of Alternatives does not include any mention of health costs associated with air pollution. Draft PEIS at Section 2.3.7.

#### A. Health Costs and Impacts

A study in Denver, Colorado expanded on the analysis of an earlier childhood cancer study to include calculations of traffic-related density and emissions. The study concludes that children residing in homes within 750 feet of roads with high traffic counts are at an increased risk of developing leukemia. See Exhibit A, attached hereto. "For children residing in homes within 750 feet of roads with the highest traffic density (>20,000 vehicles/day), the increased risk for all cancers was almost six times higher and the risk for leukemia more than eight times higher than for children with the lowest traffic density exposures." See Exhibit B, attached hereto. Although such studies may be handicapped by small sample sizes, "[r]eal-world monitoring studies indicate that roads contribute to elevated pollutant concentrations in close proximity to the road site (especially within 100 m)." See Exhibit C, attached hereto. Several towns along the corridor, including Idaho Springs, have residences and businesses within 100 meters of I-70.

Moreover, heavy-truck traffic will increase on I-70. "Recent research suggests that the particulate fraction of diesel exhaust is the dominant contributor to urban air toxic-related health risks." *Id.* at Section 6.5.2; citing SCAQMD (2000) Multiple air toxics exposure study in the South Coast Air Basin: MATES II. Final report (and appendices) prepared by the South Coast Air Quality Management District, Diamond Bar, CA, March. See Exhibit D, attached hereto. The relationship between more highway lanes and increased truck traffic also is in need of study.

The Draft PEIS states at page 3.1-7 under "Mobile Source Air Toxics," "that without the necessary standards and analytical methods, CDOT and FHWA cannot determine the specific impacts or contribution of the Corridor to MSATs." Yet, the agencies conclude that "localized concentrations of MSATs in the vicinity of I-70 and along other roadways in the Corridor would be similar to those experienced by individuals, residences, businesses, and other facilities located at similar distances from roadways with similar volumes and operating characteristics." Therefore, it is incumbent upon the agencies to evaluate in the PEIS studies performed in other areas with similar factors. Such studies as the "Transportation-Related Air Toxics: Case Study Materials Related to US 95 in Nevada," prepared by Sonoma Technology, Inc., and the materials referenced therein, represent available scientific data that the agencies must evaluate in the PEIS. See Exhibit C, attached hereto.

Moreover, the agencies must consider the health impacts from air pollution even though the following statement may be true: "MSAT emissions in the project are will decrease over time as a result of EPA's national MSATs control programs." Draft PEIS, page 3.1-7. The environmental impact of a highway alternative may be significant though its severity may be reduced over time. The case study for US 95 referenced above concludes that "[e]ven if the DPM [Diesel PM] URF [underlying risk factor] were reduced by an order of magnitude, a possibility given the range of risks discussed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2002a), total MATES-II air toxics risks would still be approximately 500 excess cancer deaths per million exposed people, and mobile sources (on-road and non-road) would be responsible for over 70% of the estimated risks." *Id.* at Section 3.4.

#### II. Scoping Process Defective

The Council on Environmental Quality regulations provide a process to determine the scope of the issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. 40 C.F.R. § 1501.7. The "scope" consists of the range of actions, alternatives, and impacts to be considered in an environmental impact statement." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.25. Regarding impacts, agencies must consider direct, indirect and cumulative impacts for each alternative. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.25 (c).

The Draft PEIS failed to consider the health impacts from air pollution. The analysis of the NAAQS shows that significant air pollution impacts are attributable to the highway alternatives. Therefore, the Draft PEIS is defective and must be withdrawn for further study and comparison of such health impacts among the alternatives.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. Vincze  
of Greenberg Traurig, LLP

Attorneys for the Clear Creek Economic  
Development Corporation

cc: Peggy Stokstad, President and CEO, CCEDC

Categorized  
Comment

681

Greenberg and  
Traurig, Legal  
Counsel, on  
behalf of Clear  
Creek  
Economic  
Development

Associations  
& Special  
Interest  
Groups

5/20/2005

Greenberg Traurig

May 20, 2005

Cecilia Joy, Project Manager  
Colorado Department of Transportation  
Region 1

Written



Corporation

18500 East Colfax Avenue  
Aurora, Colorado 80011Jean Wallace, P.E.  
Senior Operations Engineer  
Federal Highway Administration  
12300 West Dakota Avenue  
Lakewood, Colorado 80228

Re: I-70 PEIS, Additional Comments for the Administrative Record, Section 106, Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation

On behalf of the Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation the undersigned of the law firm of Greenberg Traurig, LLP, respectfully submits the following comments for inclusion in the administrative record for the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement & Section 4(f) Evaluation, December 2004 ("Draft PEIS"). Again, thank you for extending the comment period to participate in the process for the potential improvement of this important transportation corridor.

## Section 106 Consultation Inadequate and Procedurally Defective

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act ("NHPA") requires that federal agencies consider the effects of their actions on historic resources before funding, licensing, or otherwise proceeding with projects that may affect historic resources listed in, or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, 16 U.S.C. § 470f. As set forth in the written comments on the administrative record for the PEIS submitted by the Town of Georgetown, the Town of Silver Plume, Historic Georgetown, Inc., The Historic District Public Lands Commission, and the Mill Creek Valley Historical Society (adopted herein by reference), and as partially catalogued in the Section 3.15 of the Draft PEIS, the corridor contains many historic properties. Therefore, it is incumbent on the agencies to "take into account the effects of their undertakings" on such historic properties.

The FHWA and CDOT state that "[c]ompliance with Section 106 will be completed during subsequent Tier 2 project-level environmental analysis, documentation, and review." Draft PEIS at 3.15.1.2. It goes on to state that the agencies will execute a programmatic agreement ("PA") for the PEIS before preparation of a Record of Decision. In this way the agencies seek to move forward with an incomplete evaluation of the effects from project alternatives on historic properties. This procedure is flawed for the following reasons.

The elimination of transit alternatives prior to the evaluation of the effects of the alternatives violates the spirit and intent of the NHPA. Such an action "restricts the subsequent consideration of alternatives to avoid, minimize or mitigate the undertaking's adverse effects on historic properties." 36 C.F.R. § 880.1(c).

Here, the Draft PEIS makes determinations regarding transit and non-transit alternatives without the requisite and appropriate analysis of impacts on historic properties. Such action does not accord with the NHPA or NEPA. See California v. Block, 690 F.2d 753, 765 (9th Cir. 1982). When a large project is proposed, the agencies "may not rely upon . . . the task's magnitude to excuse the absence of a reasonably thorough site-specific analysis of the decision's environmental consequences." *Id.*, citing Environmental Defense Fund v. Andrus, 596 F.2d 848, 851-52 (9th Cir. 1979).

As you know, "tiering" deals with the relationship of programmatic and site-specific NEPA documents. This mechanism allows agencies to incorporate information contained in programmatic documents by referring to them in later site-specific NEPA documents. Tiering, however, is not a means to avoid issues. A Tier 1 analysis must not eliminate alternatives that restrict the agencies' ability to "avoid, minimize or mitigate the undertaking's adverse effects on historic properties." It is not appropriate at the Tier 1 level to ignore environmental sensitivity for the selection of a preferred alternative. The Draft PEIS attempts to make a determination regarding transit and non-transit alternatives without the requisite level of NHPA or NEPA analysis.

The regulations under the NHPA do provide for phased identification and evaluation "where alternatives under consideration consist of corridors or large land areas" if the agencies enter into a programmatic agreement. 36 C.F.R. § 800.4(b)(2). Nevertheless, a programmatic agreement to resolve adverse effects of remaining alternatives when potentially better transit alternatives already have been eliminated negates the purpose of the NHPA to preserve historic properties "in the face of ever-increasing extensions of . . . highways. . ." 16 U.S.C. § 470(b)(5). As stated above, an after-the-fact programmatic agreement "restricts the subsequent consideration of alternatives to avoid, minimize or mitigate the undertaking's adverse effects on historic properties." 36 C.F.R. § 800.1(c).

In any event, the agencies cannot delay compliance with the NHPA unless they secure a programmatic agreement. If they do not do so before the issuance of the Record of Decision on the PEIS, then the agencies must develop measures to "avoid, minimize, or mitigate" adverse effects and then bind themselves to these measures in the Record of Decision. 36 C.F.R. § 800.8(c)(4).

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the Draft PEIS is inadequate under the NHPA and NEPA. It violates the spirit and intent of both acts. The agencies must withdraw and supplement the Draft PEIS with an evaluation of historic properties under subpart B of 36 C.F.R. Part 800.

In the alternative, if the agencies plan to defer compliance with the NHPA until after a preferred alternative is selected, they must at least secure a programmatic agreement prior to the issuance of the Record of Decision on the PEIS. If not, the agencies must develop measures to "avoid, minimize, or mitigate" adverse effects and then bind themselves to these measures in the Record of Decision. 36 C.F.R. § 800.8(c)(4).

Respectfully submitted  
Robert J. Vincze  
of Greenberg Traurig, LLP  
Attorneys for the Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation

cc: Peggy Stokstad, President and CEO, CCEDC

Categorized Comment	679	Greenberg and Traurig, Legal Counsel, on behalf of Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/21/2005	Greenberg Traurig May 21, 2005 Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011 Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228 Re: I-70 Draft PEIS, Additional Comments for the Administrative Record, Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation—Improper Segmentation On behalf of the Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation ("CCEDC"), the undersigned of the law firm of Greenberg Traurig, LLP, respectfully submits the following comments for inclusion in the administrative record for the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement & Section 4(f) Evaluation, December 2004 ("Draft PEIS"). Again, thank you for extending the comment period to participate in the process for the potential improvement of the greater I-70 transportation corridor. The Segmentation of the Project to the Mountain Corridor is Improper As a general rule under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), segmentation of highway projects is improper for purposes of preparing environmental impact statements. See, e.g., <i>Ross v. Federal Highway Administration</i> , 62 F.3d 1046 (10th Cir. 1998); <i>Sierra Club v. Callaway</i> , 499 F.2d 962 (5th Cir. 1974). To determine whether a segment is an appropriate scope for an EIS, courts have considered such factors as whether the proposed segment (1) has logical termini; (2) has substantial independent utility; (3) does not foreclose the opportunity to consider alternatives; and (4) does not irretrievably commit federal funds for closely related projects. <i>Id.</i> , see also <i>Swain v. Brinegar</i> , 542 F.2d 364 (7th Cir. 1976); <i>Trout Unlimited v. Morton</i> , 509 F.2d 1276 (9th Cir. 1974); <i>Indian Lookout Alliance v. Volpe</i> , 484 F.2d 11 (8th Cir. 1973); <i>Named Individual Members of San Antonio Conversation Society v. Texas State Highway Dept.</i> , 446 F.2d 1013 (5th Cir. 1971). Considering these factors, the I-70 Intermountain Corridor is an improper segmentation of the transportation project since it is not logical and forecloses other alternatives. The Colorado Department of Transportation ("CDOT") and the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA") have improperly segmented the project to foreclose alternatives that do not involve more highway lanes by providing for an eastern terminus at C-470, e.g., the Draft PEIS states that the "Advanced Guideway System (AGS) alternative would provide transit service from C-470 to the Eagle County Airport." P. 2-32. As shown below, the project study should begin at the Denver International Airport instead of at C-470. Since much of the traffic entering the mountain corridor originates outside of it, the terminus at C-470 is not logical and will foreclose rail transit alternatives. 2 Beginning the project at the Denver International	Written

Airport, would serve to increase ridership on an advanced guideway or rail transit system. People from out of town would be apt to use such a transit system, and a terminus at the Denver International Airport would increase ridership from the front range. (See the ridership surveys that CDOT should make a part of the administrative record.) By limiting the eastern terminus of the project to C-470, it becomes a foregone conclusion that most people will continue on in their loaded cars past Golden and add to the congestion that the project is intended to alleviate. The stated need of the project "to increase capacity, improve accessibility and mobility, and decrease congestion" is not served by beginning the project at C-470. Draft PEIS at p. 1-1.

Moreover, the vision of the I-70 Mountain Corridor Major Investment Study ("MIS") included a desire to change visitors' travel in a meaningful way by incorporating transit, and most visitors' travel begins at the Denver International Airport. An AGS or rail transit alternative would fulfill the vision of the MIS, which vision the Draft PEIS ignores.

The termini also figure into capital cost. Tolling is used increasingly to pay for transportation projects through bonding. The inclusion of objectives that can be solved best by tolling is allowable under NEPA. *Sierra Club v. USDOT*, 962 F.Supp. 1037 (N.D. Ill. 1997). The Draft PEIS limits the ability to "toil" transit alternatives by beginning them at C-470 instead of at the Denver International Airport. It goes on to state that "[a]lthough the AGS would meet the project need and offer environmental and community impacts primarily in the least to intermediate range for many of the evaluated resources, it is not preferred because it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative due to its high capital cost of \$6.15 billion." The agencies also recognize that the AGS has high ultimate capacity and that it is the fastest transit alternative with the lowest overall fatality rating of the Transit alternatives. Draft PEIS, p. 2-32. Thus, but for the arbitrary capital cost limitation of \$4 billion placed on alternatives by CDOT, the AGS alternative would be the preferred alternative by the agencies' own findings.

Notwithstanding the fact that the estimated cost of the AGS has fallen markedly in recent studies (see comments by Ed Rapp and members of the I-70 Task Force), if the eastern terminus of the project were extended to the Denver International Airport, and considering the ridership surveys, such capital could be raised by bonding based on the great demand and preference for such transit coupled with a reasonable fare structure designed to meet such demand. In the ways set forth above, setting the eastern terminus of the PEIS at C-470 is illogical and forecloses opportunities to consider alternatives including the AGS. As such, the termini constitute an improper segmentation of the project.

#### Conclusion

The project termini in the Draft PEIS are an improper segmentation of the transportation project. The termini are not logical in light of the need for the project, and the eastern terminus at C-470 serves to foreclose opportunities to consider transit alternatives. Therefore, the Draft PEIS must be withdrawn and supplemented to include evaluation of the project with its eastern terminus extended to the Denver International Airport.

Respectfully submitted

Robert J. Vincze  
of Greenberg Traurig, LLP  
Attorneys for the CCEDC

cc: Peggy Stokstad President and CEO, CCEDC

Categorized Comment	672	Greenberg and Traurig, Legal Counsel, on behalf of Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	Greenberg Traurig May 24, 2005 Via Hand-Delivery Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011 Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228 Re: I-70 Draft PEIS, Additional Comments for the Administrative Record, Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation—AGS Economically and Technically Feasible On behalf of the Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation ("CCEDC"), the undersigned of the law firm of Greenberg Traurig, LLP, respectfully submits the following comments for inclusion in the administrative record for the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement & Section 4(f) Evaluation, December 2004 ("Draft PEIS"). AGS is Economically and Technically Feasible According to the Council on Environmental Quality, "reasonable alternatives include those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense. . . ." Forty Questions Memorandum, 46 Fed. Reg. 18,027 (Question 2a) (1981). The Final Report by the Federal Transit Administration, "Urban Maglev Technology Development Program, Colorado Maglev Project," dated June 2004 (a copy of which is attached along with a cover letter and the related Executive Summary and Technical Data), shows that the Advanced Guideway System ("AGS") is feasible from the technical and economic standpoint. The Final Report shows that the AGS would perform extremely well under the adverse weather conditions present in the Corridor. The Federal Transit Authority has answered the question raised by CDOT and the FHWA about such performance on page 2-32 of the Draft PEIS. AGS works on steep grades under adverse weather conditions. Moreover, the strong indicated preference for rail transit over other modes of transportation equates to sufficient demand to support bonding and for the generation of other types of revenue to offset the capital costs of a rail transit project. See the ridership surveys that should be made a part of the administrative record. The Final Report also shows that the cost of the AGS is reduced from the cost assumptions made in the Draft PEIS. Lastly, a project without AGS will not serve the need of the project in the long-term: to increase capacity, improve accessibility and mobility, and decrease congestion. Draft PEIS, p. 1-1. The alternative chosen must satisfy the objectives of the project. Custer County Action Ass'n, 256 F.3d 1041 (10th Cir. 2001). AGS is the best alternative at handling peak demand. Respectfully submitted, Rober J. Vincze of Greenberg Traurig, LLP Attorneys for the CCEDC cc: Peggy Stokstad, President and CEO, CCEDC	Written
Categorized Comment	657	Greenberg and Traurig, Legal Counsel, on behalf of Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/22/2005	Greenberg Traurig May 22, 2005 Via FedEx Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011 Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228 Re: I-70 Draft PEIS, Additional Comments for the Administrative Record, Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation—Underlying Documents Not Made Available On behalf of the Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation ("CCEDC"), the undersigned of the law firm of Greenberg Traurig, LLP, respectfully submits the following comments for inclusion in the administrative record for the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement & Section 4(f) Evaluation, December 2004 ("Draft PEIS"). The Agencies Must Make Documents Underlying the Draft PEIS Available to the Public The ridership surveys taken by CDOT and referenced generally at a TAC/MCAC meeting were not made available to the public. To the best of the undersigned's knowledge, the surveys included preference information by	Written

the public on transit alternatives. Only limited information on the surveys was released. The dissemination of the actual surveys and responses is integral to a proper evaluation of the alternatives presented in the Draft PEIS and for meaningful participation in the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") process.

Such documents would help the public evaluate and comment on issues affecting the human environment as well as the economic feasibility of the rail transit alternatives including the Advanced Guideway System. A strong indicated preference for rail transit over other modes of transportation could equate to sufficient demand to support bonding and for the generation of other types of revenue to offset the capital costs of a rail transit project.

On two occasions, the undersigned was present when Miller Hudson and Don Dempsey, formerly with the Colorado Intermountain Fixed Guideway Authority ("CFGA"), requested copies of the actual ridership surveys from the Colorado Department of Transportation ("CDOT"), which documents it never produced. CEQ regulations require that material that is referenced in a PEIS (EIS) be "reasonably available for inspection by potentially interested persons within the time allowed for comment." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.21 (1997). The regulations also require that the agencies make available any documents "underlying" the PEIS (EIS). 40 C.F.R. § 1506.6(f).

#### Conclusion

In order to meet the requirements of NEPA as set forth in the CEQ regulations, the agencies must produce the ridership surveys to the public and allow for a reasonable extension of the comment period after such production.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. Vincze  
of Greenberg Traurig, LLP  
Attorneys for the CCEDC

cc: Peggy Stokstad, President and CEO, CCEDC

Categorized Comment	601	Greenberg and Traurig, Legal Counsel, on behalf of Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation	Associations & Special Interest Groups	5/24/2005	May 24, 2005 Via Hand-Delivery  Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011  Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228  Re: I-70 Draft PEIS, Additional Comments for the Administrative Record, Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation—AGS Economically and Technically Feasible  On behalf of the Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation ("CCEDC"), the undersigned of the law firm of Greenberg Traurig, LLP, respectfully submits the following comments for inclusion in the administrative record for the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement & Section 4(f) Evaluation, December 2004 ("Draft PEIS"). AGS is Economically and Technically Feasible  According to the Council on Environmental Quality, "reasonable alternatives include those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense. . . ." Forty Questions Memorandum, 46 Fed. Reg. 18,027 (Question 2a) (1981). The Final Report by the Federal Transit Administration, "Urban Maglev Technology Development Program, Colorado Maglev Project," dated June 2004 (a copy of which is attached along with a cover letter and the related Executive Summary and Technical Data), shows that the Advanced Guideway System ("AGS") is feasible from the technical and economic standpoint. The Final Report shows that the AGS would perform extremely well under the adverse weather conditions present in the Corridor. The Federal Transit Authority has answered the question raised by CDOT and the FHWA about such performance on page 2-32 of the Draft PEIS. AGS works on steep grades under adverse weather conditions. Moreover, the strong indicated preference for rail transit over other modes of transportation equates to sufficient demand to support bonding and for the generation of other types of revenue to offset the capital costs of a rail transit project. See the ridership surveys that should be made a part of the administrative record. The Final Report also shows that the cost of the AGS is reduced from the cost assumptions made in the Draft PEIS. Lastly, a project without AGS will not serve the need of the project in the long-term: to increase capacity, improve accessibility and mobility, and decrease congestion. Draft PEIS, p. 1-1. The alternative chosen must satisfy the objectives of the project. Custer County Action Ass'n, 256 F.3d 1041 (10th Cir. 2001). AGS is the best alternative at handling peak demand. Respectfully submitted,  Robert J. Vincze of Greenberg Traurig, LLP Attorneys for the CCEDC cc: Peggy Stokstad, President and CEO, CCEDC	Online
Categorized Comment	355	Von Der Lippe, Susan	Public	2/16/2005	Hello, I'm Susan von der Lippe. I live in Loveland, Colorado, and I came down because there haven't been any meetings up north. So I came down tonight to express my views of the I-70 corridor. I'm a native of Colorado, but I've lived all over the country, and I've traveled all over the world. And a lot of other countries do a much better job of mass transit than the U.S. ever has, and it does work.  So I'm here to support a nonwidening of the highway. I don't think we can keep our head in the sand and just expect that no one will want to go up in the mountains. I want to see something for my great-grandchildren in the future, and that has got to involve some sort of transportation that allows them to go up and see the beauty of the mountains. Preserve the mountains, preserve the environment, and preserve the historical -- history that we have in the mountains.  I live in Loveland, and I've discussed this with a bunch of friends and no one has even heard of this study. No one has even heard that I-70 was even being considered up there, that I know of. Yes, we've had some public hearing. Yes, it's on the website, but there's absolutely nothing in the papers to open the discussion.  There was a vote a couple years ago about a high-speed monorail and whether or not the state should fund a system to test it out. You know, there was almost nothing put in the papers to really describe the benefits of a system like this, to describe the possibility that could happen. So a vote happened with very ignorant eyes and ears. People didn't know the truth.  Loveland's editorial page wrote something that wasn't even -- they must have just looked at CDOT's opinion of it and didn't even consider the people that were really promoting it. I want to see that looked at more intensely.  I don't want to see something that takes 15 years to build of a widening of the highway that will be obsolete when it happens. That will destroy the environment. It will destroy the historical. I want to see a vision of transportation here in Colorado.  I live in Loveland. I travel to the mountains once around every six weeks. I avoid the weekends like the plague. I'll usually go up I-70 through Idaho Springs. I will leave Friday night late and I will come back on a weekday in the morning to avoid that, you know, heavy traffic. I want still the opportunity for my kids. I have a condo in Breckenridge, and that, you know, is becoming harder and harder to go see.  I want to see a vision here in Colorado. I think ideally the future, in my vision -- and I would love it to be the vision of other people -- would be a high-speed monorail from Cheyenne to Pueblo, DIA to Grand Junction.  Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	557	Von Glinski, Monika	Public	5/23/2005	Concerning the draft & public presentation of the PEIS for the I-70 corridor -  The draft PEIS presented by CDOT for the I-70 corridor, as well as the proposal & review processes in themselves, have been driven by the overt prioritization of capital profitability over considerations regarding:  1. long-term destructive environmental impacts - especially on critical watersheds, air quality, and the health of mountain fauna & flora 2. detrimental effects of growth on mountain communities 3. unintended boomerang consequences negatively impacting on the very access to	Online

the natural beauties of Colorado which the I-70 corridor is meant to provide (eg. noise & noise walls)  
 4. serious decision-making being made on a world-wide level concerning public transportation, global warming and the end of fossil fuels  
 5. the actual NEED for any expansion of I-70 traffic between Denver and Grand Junction  
 6. effectively addressing the supposed need for an expansion of I-70 traffic between Denver and Grand Junction

None of the alternatives CDOT has presented as "preferred" address any of the above-listed concerns. In fact, adding lanes and tunnels to the existing I-70 corridor amounts to the height of arrogant greedy short-sightedness. Instead of mathematically projecting population growth & private automobile use in a smoke-screen effort to camouflage profiteering interests, the public transportation agencies of both Colorado and of the federal government would do better to get vocally involved in the limitation of and development of alternatives to growth and private automobile use!!!!!! Many "solutions" to the so-called "problem" of traffic on the existing I-70 corridor involve merely an immediate change in mind-set and cultural prioritization:

1. The mandatory transfer of all long-distance commercial truck transportation to rail transportation would immediately reduce both the incidence of traffic jams & fatal traffic accidents along this corridor, would dramatically reduce air pollution, would dramatically reduce our nation's dependency on foreign oil, and would put funds back into the former glory of our nation's railroad network.
2. Stepping up the schedule of RTD bus transportation and of the Winter Park Ski Train between Denver/Boulder and the main mountain communities AND integrating this stepped-up schedule with improved urban connection nodes could dramatically reduce private automobile use through the I-70 corridor. A strong public awareness campaign to this end would not only cost much less than the projected budgets for any of your "preferred" solutions, but would save the population of Colorado a 35-year construction-site nightmare.

If, indeed, any structural improvements to the existing I-70 corridor should be necessary in the near future, ONLY ONE of your proposed alternatives effectively addresses any and all the criteria you listed on the graphs laid out on page 4 of the PEIS and that is the AGS, the elevated monorail which would require no or only minimal expansion of the existing I-70 footprint.

CDOT could have taken on a leading role in the public dialogue concerning the responsible expansion of the transportation grid in Colorado; CDOT could have elaborated a long-term modern vision for the state within a world drastically threatened by environmental collapse. Instead, CDOT has presented the citizens of Colorado with a PEIS from within the confines of the Orwellian discourse which continues protecting greed, the maximization of profit, political kickbacks, and the total dismissal of civic responsibility within the USA. In publically presenting and comparing the costs of all alternatives, CDOT has been dishonest with regard to the total long-term costs to the environment, to human well-being & the preservation of wildlife, to the future of Colorado as one of the most beautiful wild areas within the Rocky Mtns., to the quality of life of future generations, to the planet Earth. The slick graphs & posters displayed at the public hearings concerning the Draft PEIS for the I-70 Mountain Corridor ended up becoming - for most of us who attended - posters for CDOT's dishonest and disrespectful avoidance of honest dialogue with the citizens of Colorado. Luckily, we are telling you so.

Signed,  
 Monika von Glinski and  
 Eric Grossman

(both residents of 614 Chickadee Road  
 Golden, Co. 80401  
 in Mount Vernon Country Club on  
 Lookout Mtn.)

Categorized Comment	ID	Name	Type	Date	Text	Category
Categorized Comment	72	Wachtel, Howard	Public	1/15/2005	<p>The No Action or Minimal Action mode is the best approach!</p> <p>The "growth of demand" model assumptions are quite specious. There are numerous contingencies that have not been taken into account such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Growth in Telecommuting and Flextime among mountain community residents (Georgetown, etc.) who are "based" elsewhere</li> <li>- Escalation of fuel prices that will change downward travel patterns</li> <li>- Global warming may cause a large decline in skiers and the traffic they generate</li> </ul> <p>Similar projections of traffic and population growth along I-70 corridor were made in the 1970s and early 1980s--and never came true!</p> <p>DO NOT SPEND \$BILLIONS and disrupt lives for 15 years for a project that is NOT NEEDED.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	179	Wachtel, Howard	Public	1/15/2005	<p>H. Wachtel. I live up in Boulder County.</p> <p>I was curious to see that there are many models for ways of mitigating the problem, but there's only one model for defining what the problem is, which is growth of the population traffic that will increase the demand on I-70.</p> <p>And I would suggest that there are many possibilities that could occur in the upcoming years, most of which would not lead to the conclusion that you've just presented about demand. For example, my sense is that as the people move out into the foothills around Boulder and up to communities like Georgetown, they tend to telecommute rather than going to work every day and being there from 9 to 5. People who like to ski tend to take jobs that have flex time and they can ski during the middle of the week. And I think this pattern that gets us away from traditional traffic patterns is going to continue over the years, and, indeed, would be inspired by people's ability to get away from peak traffic hours.</p> <p>Other issues I just wanted to mention is fuel prices. You need to run a model of what would happen if the price of gas goes to \$5 a gallon. At today's prices, that's going to have an effect of decreasing traffic. And global warming, it may very well be that in 20 years the ski industry will be actually less vibrant than it is today. I think you need to go back and start with a different set of assumptions as to growth. You've taken the most pessimistic one.</p> <p>And I would also point out in that I recall in the late '70s and early '80s there were all kinds of projections for growth, particularly along the I-70 corridor, based on things like oil shale industries, et cetera, and these never came to pass. So I think that unless you can show that your need comes about from different models, that you're addressing solutions for a problem that probably doesn't exist. You're going to disrupt peoples' lives for 15 years for no purpose.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	357	Wageling, Jon	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Hello. I'm Jon Wageling. I live right over in the community, right about half a mile from here. I'm speaking on behalf of Golden Heights and Golden Hills, the residents of.</p> <p>And one of our concerns is, as sit we here, I told all the community that there was an environmental impact study going on here, and we went through the paper. And I've got a petition. 46 people out of 50 people right here in this community concerned not so much with the future impacts of I-70 but the impact that it's imposing on us currently.</p> <p>The noise levels in our community are reaching over -- over the 55, 65 -- I've got sound studies as high as 72 decibels coming right in off the highway over here. And this affects our parks, and this affects the health issues associated with it. And our concerns in this community is what can be done to address these issues that are here upon us today as opposed to what you're doing -- what CDOT's doing for future.</p> <p>I know there's been a study in that C-470 corridor when they built that. We're all feeling the impact of the high volume that I-70 is carrying. And, again, our community is very concerned, and we would like someone to address or give us directions on whom we can speak to to address some immediate actions on those impacts.</p> <p>So those are my comments. More than anything else is that we've got some concerns here, guys, not so much for the future but how are we going to address the impacts of the affected communities as we are today.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	397	Warner, Jill	Public	3/22/2005	<p>I am not in favor of widening I-70. Other alternatives should be explored.</p>	Online

Categorized Comment	213	Warren, Rick	Public	2/23/2005	I do not support 6-lane expansion and double tunnels.  I do support a fixed guideway transit system - HOT. - Bus fixed guided. This should also run to DIA. - Enhanced bus operations to supplement fixed guideway transit system. - Intermodal transfer centers - Consider alternative routes outside of Hwy ROW  It is interesting that this mtg was not listed today in the Summit Daily News??	Form
Categorized Comment	765	Warren, Rick	Public	5/18/2005	1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?  Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)  2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.  No response.	Written
Categorized Comment	667	Weaver, Bert	Public	5/24/2005	May 24, 2005  Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Chris Paulsen, I-70 Mountain Corridor Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, Colorado 80011  Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer, FHWA 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, Colorado 80228  Dear Cecilia, Chris and Jean,  As a person named in the Revised Reconnaissance Survey of the I-70 Mountain Corridor as the owner of an historic property at 1925 County Road 308 in Lawson, I wish to point out the inaccuracies and insufficiency of the property's description and described historic value. Known as the "Lawson Schoolhouse," it was built in 1878 as clearly indicated on a placard near the peak of the south gable above the main entry vestibule. The 1910 date published in the Revised Reconnaissance Survey is incorrect and diminishes actual historic value. My own research suggests that this structure is the oldest frame schoolhouse of its size, still standing, in the State of Colorado. If this is incorrect, I would like to know which other frame schoolhouses are older so I can include them in my research.  I believe the description of the architectural style as "vernacular bungalow" is also incorrect, not only with reference to my own property but to other structures in the community. "Bungalow" generally implies a one-story house or cottage with a low-pitched roof often of Hindu influence, none of which applies to the Schoolhouse's architectural history. My own steep roofs are reflected in other structures throughout the community, even though the Survey refers to them as "bungalow" also. The video and related information previously given to your offices by the Mill Creek Valley Historical Society better reflects the historic sensitivity of the Dumont-Lawson-Downieville community.  Thank you for your consideration of these comments.  Sincerely, Berten R. Weaver, Owner The Lawson School 1925 County Road 308 Clear Creek County, Colorado 80436	Written
Categorized Comment	271	Weaver, Bert	Public	2/2/2005	All I want to say is: I couldn't help noticing that out of all the public testimony this evening, there was no one who favored the preferred alternative. That's it. That is the end of my comment.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	142	Weaver, Bert	Public	1/12/2005	Thank you for providing the many opportunities and formats to comment.  I'll just stand on my toes.  I'd like to thank Ed Rapp, because if all of his questions are answered, so will mine, at least for tonight. But I would like to emphasize a point that Ed and others made that was reflected on one of the charts about economic growth. I guess this is the REM model. I think that chart somehow diminishes or does not accurately represent the impacts during the construction period, and just growth in general. It showed a growth rate that the impacts of construction would cause a slight dip to.  First, I'd like to just see that growth rate in this community projected over the next years. So I question that. And then to see the large plume of growth at the end of finally surviving the construction period I think is also questionable. I think that that chart must not represent very well the impact to our economics, as I mentioned, but also to our mobility during that construction period and to safety.  And I think that the elimination of what seemed to be better long-range solutions because they're not affordable seems short-sided to me. And I would also like to side with the request for a longer time horizon -- planning horizon.  And also, I'm not sure anybody else asked for this specifically, but I look at all these charts, you could study every one of them for a day and use that for the whole review period. So I think we need more time to review all of this information.  Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	165	Weaver, Bert	Public	1/15/2005	Thank you. My name is Bert Weaver. I am a resident and business owner in historic Lawson. I-70 borders my property on one side and historic US 6 and 40 alignment on the other. I try to embrace transportation enhancement, but I'm feeling a little squeezed.  I would like to start at this chart, which was made some reference to the other night. That is to say, I think this is unfair to present the gross regional growth rate when Clear Creek County is flat, especially when the flat growth rate does not reflect the dilution of our emergency and other services by services to the highway itself. I hear the term "environmental justice." I don't think that's it.  Also, I'd like to make reference to some other what I consider misnomers in your charts. Water resources over here really looks at water quality; it ignores the quantity of water resources. And ignoring that in our state seems pretty narrow and short-sighted. Just one example being the 1981 decreed -- storage decree for the Clear Creek water-user alliance reservoirs at Kermit's, which would flood the canyon up to Hidden Valley. I rejected the notion that this would never happen because I think that the statewide water supply analysis indicates otherwise, that no one would give up a reservoir that was decreed in '81.  Other misnomers. I think that the no action and the minimal action description -- title is a misnomer by the information that you've just presented. That alternative could also be described as the most affordable, most financially constrained alternative with least impact and most easily implemented.  I think that suppressed demand is also a misnomer. That might just be delayed demand. In fact, if over the next 20 years we're able to suppress the demand at peak times and transfer it to nonpeak, I think that's a plus. I think that we need a longer planning horizon because the plan for widening without implementation of an alternative to widening will only induce more widening.  In short, in Lawson, I think the alternatives presented provide more noise, less mobility, and less safety in a historic community.  Thank you.	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	268	Weaver, Bert	Public	2/2/2005	Thank you. My name is Bert Weaver. I'm a resident of Clear Creek County and a resident of Denver.  I've come to know this corridor pretty well. Looking at the same data that you have presented, I would just like to offer a different perspective on a few of the items, a few examples. You referred to this chart before, showing an upward trend. That doesn't fit down here and show the Clear Creek County trend -- economic future, flat. I will put that one on the top, and I think that might leave a different impression -- although now the assets are falling apart. And this -- that flat trend does not take into consideration all the other things that you've heard this evening about additional economic impacts to the Clear Creek County community.  Other data that has been presented that I don't see -- that I don't see the same way it is presented	Transcripts

includes that \$4 billion threshold. I don't think that takes into consideration the different lifespans and the different investments. It does seem arbitrary. And I believe that was presented right after or a couple of slides after another summary -- that the transit analysis that said that the highway solution had no subsidy compared to the others. I think that also is a real misrepresentation of transportation funding in this country.

Also, the growth rate. We have learned about the projections in vehicle traffic. And I don't think -- as a professional planner for 30 years, I've learned how these projections of growth rates are so often wrong, sometimes dramatically wrong. And I think that going through 15 years of construction to arrive at a solution that is designed on 1990s travel behavior will land us with an outdated solution at that time because so much will change.

The gentleman who talked about carpooling, all of that capacity that we're seeing as a future demand could really fit in existing vehicles and empty seats if you were to pursue carpooling. Also, the travel behavior in 20 years will be different for a number of other reasons: Technology and just choices in travel behavior.

I also would present the no-action, minimal-action alternative summary differently. I think you've eliminated that. It seems like several of the others I've actually heard you present before. Intelligent vehicles or an intelligent transportation systems are the ones that I look to 20, 25 years from now of reducing this projected demand that you have shown.

I think that, in fact, in consideration of the -- this impact upon mobility by construction for 15 years, the no-action and minimal-action alternative really provides the most mobility for that next 15- to 20-year period. So I just -- I see these differently.

I think that for now, that really is a summary of my comments. And you don't need to hold up the 30-second sign.

Categorized Comment	367	Weaver, Bert	Public	2/16/2005	<p>Thank you. My name is Bert Weaver. I'm not sure you're the people with whom I need to be addressing the comments, so I'll keep looking around from side to side. I am a resident of Clear Creek County and of Denver. I have been a community designer or community planner now for over 30 years, serving communities mostly along this I-70 corridor.</p> <p>When it comes to transportation planning, I have two favorite words: Multimodal and intermodal. Multimodal and intermodal are my two favorite words in transportation planning. These words were memorialized in documents known as Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. Intermodal surface transportation efficiency. I also just like that phrase.</p> <p>This was a vision that the federal funding -- transportation funding act passed in 1991, and that just brings about a vision. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, it's a vision that depicts the future of transportation. The only problem is that out here in the West I heard that some people think that multimodal means the four-wheel drive button on the dashboard. So I'm hoping that we can overcome that.</p> <p>Intermodal means all transportation modes at the same time are required for efficiency, not that you build one mode so that -- that it requires other modes to feed into it and then wait to build the other modes. That doesn't make sense. So tonight I think that I would just like to express that we can better embrace the vision of intermodal surface transportation efficiency.</p> <p>We've already invested a lot in one mode. We are pretty much singular mode, certainly through Clear Creek County. It's time to invest in the alternate modes, the other modes. In short, I think it's time to invest in the AGS and nonmotorized -- I know you all know me as a nonmotorized transportation advocate -- and transit and that these are the best ways to plan for the long-term visions.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
---------------------	-----	--------------	--------	-----------	---	-------------

Categorized Comment	364	Westman, Roger	Public	2/16/2005	<p>I'm Roger Westman, a proud resident of Clear Creek County.</p> <p>I would like to refer you first back to the PowerPoint presentation we saw a little bit ago. Remember that inverted violet triangle? That was a pinch point really. It was from Floyd Hill to the Eisenhower Tunnel. That's Clear Creek County. Every damn inch of it.</p> <p>Then, remember the curves that looked like this and showed where the economy is going to take a hit? But the good news was, that after this project is completed, in ten more years, we'll be back where we're supposed to be, a \$10 billion gap. Clear Creek County doesn't have 10,000 residents. If you do the math and dirty math on that, that \$10 million divided by 10,000 people is a million dollars each. If they settled for that, we'd do it now.</p> <p>Now, I want to ask you -- a little exercise.</p> <p>How many of us have been to the top of Pikes Peak? Raise your hand. Okay. Cool. The first guy that saw that, or the guy that saw that, Robert [INAUDIBLE] said it would never be climbed. Well, we just proved the summit of that got climbed.</p> <p>I have a visual. The second visual this evening. This more or less squiggly vertical line is the Continental Divide. Those crosshatches, there's 13 of them in our state, are where state and federal highways need to get through -- through or over the Continental Divide. Now, I have an idea. It probably isn't original, but I figure, if you can't be true to yourself, who can you be true to?</p> <p>Okay. You all know 285 is just more or less a pretty big project. It's a pretty good road. It comes out of C-470 or Hampden and it goes down to South Park. Now, if you look at the map, you'll see that I-70 is a big dip at Copper Mountain if you take 285 down to -- again, take your pick, I'll leave it to the experts, and hook up with Grant, cross the Continental Divide, Copper Mountain, Keystone, and Breckenridge, you get folks to the ski areas, you give an alternative with a -- we can fix up our road and have an alternate. And I bet you can make it in the same time that you make the trip on I-70. And it would cost a hell of a lot less than \$4 billion.</p> <p>That's it.</p>	Transcripts
---------------------	-----	----------------	--------	-----------	--	-------------

Categorized Comment	291	Westman, Roger	Public	2/9/2005	<p>I have some anecdotal comments and observations. Over the course of many years, I've come in contact with quite a few CDOT employees and, in my experience, every one of them was pleasant and good folks. So any of these comments are not meant on a personal nature. I have some observations.</p> <p>I think that collectively CDOT lacks leadership. I'm a part-time volunteer at the Georgetown Visitor Center, and we pass out a lot of state highway maps -- this is a little small station, but I think it illustrates a lack of leadership. The new highway maps are a disgrace. The plains gray and printed on white paper, the part that we live in has a nice mountain illustrations and the ink in which the towns are printed is very close to the color of the mountains. I mean, how long have we been making maps in this state for public distribution?</p> <p>I spent quite a bit of time with the report, and I was disappointed to see that early on they quickly notified you that they, out of hand, in my opinion, dismissed all sorts of alternatives or other approaches. I take offense to that. I also took offense to the fact that we have -- as far as I know, have never gotten any -- any help, discernable help, from the governor's office. In my opinion, he didn't have enough courtesy to come talk to us last time we were voting on something that was important to our county. You made me forget what I was saying.</p> <p>When you look at the map now, just pretend in your head you can see Denver and you can see 285 coming down on Hampden. It goes down to Conifer, it goes to Chambers Crossing, it goes to Pine, it goes to Bailey, it goes to Grand. If you just stop there -- it doesn't need to be where you stop, it's just out there in your head -- and you look, it isn't very far to Copper Mountain. It isn't very far to Breckenridge. It isn't very far to Keystone.</p> <p>Before I go on, we should know that there was an Army officer who first came to our great state, saw the mountains, and he said that, "That mountain will never be climbed." That was Zebulon Pike. Well, we did it. There's a lot of things we can do.</p> <p>Now, if we had an alternate route to the areas I described, it would allow that part of our state to develop better and get people to come to, for example, DIA have an option, rather than messing with us. And here's our proposition: They're going to take 15 years and somewhere in the vicinity of \$4 billion, only 40 percent of which they think they can find in the next ten years, and give us -- give us not just inconvenience by a gigantic disruption. And when they're all done, we have no noticeable improvements.</p> <p>Now, I heard a saying that I think -- I like humor, as some of you know, and it says the dogs bark but the caravan moves on. Well, I want us to stop the caravan.</p>	Transcripts
---------------------	-----	----------------	--------	----------	---	-------------

Categorized Comment	311	Wheelock, Eileen	Public	2/9/2005	<p>I'm Eileen Wheelock. That's my husband -- a hard act to follow.</p> <p>I haven't written anything tonight. I've just been listening, as I hope you all have. I know you're family people. I'm sure you have children, grandchildren, nieces, nephews. We're passionate about those in our lives, their health, and I just hope that you can be a person, not just an employee, and think about the conditions that we're talking about here and how they're going to affect us when you're writing these</p>	Transcripts
---------------------	-----	------------------	--------	----------	---	-------------

things. Think about it with your heart and soul, and you can understand why we're so passionate here.

We love this area. You guys are in Colorado too. You know how you got here -- I don't know -- and why you're here. Maybe it's your job; maybe it's because you like it. We certainly do. We just ask you to be caring people that you probably are in all the other aspects of your lives and put yourselves in our position.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	388	Whelock, Eileen	Public	2/23/2005	<p>Hello. My name is Eileen Wheelock. I've spoken to CDOT at two other public hearings. I live in Clear Creek County. I'm a third-generation Coloradan. My family started up in Nevadaville, up above Central City for those who aren't familiar with the area.</p> <p>I'm coming tonight to talk more to Summit County residents rather than to CDOT. They know what their -- they've heard me talk before, and they know what they're dealing with, but the economics of Clear Creek County will be greatly impacted.</p> <p>And I really feel that I've heard some things tonight from Summit County residents that really scare me. I mean, I don't know if I want to cry or if I want to yell at you because you're not taking into consideration a lot of what Clear Creek County residents are having to deal with now just trying to figure out this PEIS and what we have to deal with for future.</p> <p>Any child born this year, when they turn 20, possibly that road will be complete, the alternatives will be done, the road widening will be done, and we might be out of the cone zone. I mean, those are estimates of time and money. So, you know, I just can't imagine that you want your children to grow up in a cone zone time either.</p> <p>Summit County has a lot of large corporation support here to weather their estimated 15 years of cone zone; Clear Creek County doesn't. We're a mom-and-pop situation there, and always have been, always will be, as long as we can. We don't get those big dollars coming in. And, you know, we'd like to, but we don't have the area, for one, and we're a pretty narrow canyon. And I'm not really sure how much growth we would want in the long run anyway even if that canyon wasn't as narrow as it is.</p> <p>Summit County needs to also think about what's going to be happening to them for the 15-year cone zone. Property transfers will probably be very slow. The market prices may change and drop. Skiing choices may change too, maybe to Southwest Colorado or Utah. Construction needs will probably drop. Suppliers may choose to add extended travel time with their drivers and vehicles to the prices they charge Summit County businesses. Larger parking lots would need -- would be required if any of these CDOT alternatives -- by any of these CDOT alternatives to satisfy the increase in the cars that they would be bringing -- the road would be bringing.</p> <p>The communities of Breckenridge, Keystone, Frisco, Silverthorne, to me, all seem to make it convenient to their visitors and residents to use a bus to get around the area. This keeps the environment cleaner, parking lots smaller, and their roads less congested. These communities are looking at ways to make community -- commuting within those areas better for the future of their inhabitants. That is what CDOT needs to do with their choice of alternatives.</p> <p>A monorail can bring Summit County, their visitors and residents in a much cleaner progressive way, in half the time of the nine alternatives -- or ten alternatives represented here.</p> <p>To one of the commenters earlier, about changing the car culture, I think we can change the car culture. And I think that having a monorail could increase -- I think we have to change the car culture. I think we have to change the car culture not just in this county, not just this corridor, but in this country and in this world.</p> <p>Europe and other areas are dealing with this in other ways, and there's no reason why we shouldn't be thinking in the future and be more progressive about our ideas. People could come from all over the world to see the monorail, not just to see these ski areas.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	152	Whelock, Eileen	Public	1/12/2005	<p>My name is Eileen Wheelock, and I'm a fourth-generation Idaho Springs resident.</p> <p>I'm concerned why the study did not start at DIA instead of starting at C-470. It seems like the area between C-470 and DIA over the course of the next 20 years will also grow as your charts show for the state, and so that widening will also need to be taken care of. If a fixed guideway system is incorporated into our corridor, people could get on the AGS directly from DIA and it would be a major asset to Colorado.</p> <p>Also I'd like to see more information on how many homes, business, and private property would need to be purchased for each mode of your alternatives, and, again, see those costs included in your study.</p> <p>And I would also like to say: Please extend the review comment period. There's a lot of information, and I think people need to have more time to take it in and figure out exactly what it is.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	149	Whelock, Randall	Public	1/12/2005	<p>My name is Randy Wheelock. I live in Empire and have lived in the county for 30 years.</p> <p>Ms. Joy's presentation stated the purpose of the project. The purpose of the project are, among other factors, to address environmental and community issues. In the end, in fact, the determination of the PEIS and final determination of Tier I was specifically paving solution; that's been made almost solely on the cost. The exclusion of the AGS system has been made solely on the cost.</p> <p>I believe that it's possible that the \$4 billion limit, and particularly the 20-year life cycle costing, has been done as a screening tool. As evidence, I'd like to offer some of the methods that were used in the failing, flawed cost analysis of the AGS.</p> <p>On page 48 of the executive study, it states that the mitigation costs, which total 44 percent, will be the same as those you used for paving solutions. Those include 4 percent for drainage utilities, 1 percent for signing and striping, 5 percent for construction signs and traffic, 7 percent for mobilization, 2 for right-of-way, 8 for forced accounts, utilities and environmental mitigation -- same as to the highway, and 17 percent for preliminary and construction engineering. In addition, they use the same 30 percent contingency factor for the AGS as they do for the highway solutions.</p> <p>The fact of the matter is that many experts are saying this thing could be built, if we use our heads, in as little as six years. Number one, we begin to get a return on our investment much sooner, and obviously, many of these -- many of these mitigation factors will be reduced in a later fashion as a function of time.</p> <p>Secondly, in the hard cost, \$3.28 billion, there's the inclusion in that -- of the full length of the Eisenhower Tunnel when two other solutions have been suggested -- actually three. The AGS can be projected to a point higher than the divide and have a tunnel length of no more than 50 percent of the current length that's in the design.</p> <p>Secondly, it's been proposed, rather radically, that you take it through the ventilation boards of the tunnel. Some people say that will restrict ventilation. In fact, it will enhance ventilation. Because it's going to be traveling with the air -- moving with the air, it will actually act as a plunger and help push the air through the tunnel, completely eliminating tunnel costs.</p> <p>So if you take the \$3.28 million and drop out somewhere between zero and half the tunnel costs, you'll reduce the mitigation and contingency factors as much as three times of things that are already required, required at a great or a lesser extent because of the physical nature of this type of project, the AGS. Then the fact that you come up with factors that can be somewhere between 50 and 60 percent total on contingency and mitigation, we can drop well under \$3 billion on hard costs and we come up with costs that are somewhere between a two and a quarter and \$4 billion.</p> <p>So I believe that the generalization on this report has radically skewed the cost analysis against the AGS. And I believe that that's -- what I believe is the technical job that this -- the two groups has done is excellent. I believe the parameters have been established for political reasons.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	389	Whelock, Randall	Public	2/23/2005	<p>Hi. My name is Randy Wheelock, and I've met a couple of you before already.</p> <p>Is this a voice-activated system when this thing is on? I notice it cuts out every once in a while. Is that what's going on?</p> <p>I'm a -- as of March the 1st, I will have lived in Clear Creek County for exactly a third of a century, thirty-three and one-third years. I enjoy living there a lot. All the time that I've lived there, I've both worked and recreated in the mountains, including a lot of the time in Summit County. And for the last 16 years, specifically, I've worked exclusively in Summit County building wonderful custom homes, of which I'm very proud. So I understand very much the need for growth. I understand the need for a healthy economy in the county. And I understand how much beauty you already have here, just like a lot of what we have and care about in Clear Creek County as well.</p> <p>A bunch of years ago I bought a boat for 9,500 bucks. And, as of the last count, I think I have \$5.7 billion</p>	Transcripts

I've sunk into that boat, about the same as an advanced guideway system. And I only offer that as evidence that we don't make all of our decisions in life based on two bags of gold that you set on a scale.

I think that we decide what's beautiful or we decide what we like or we decide what we want to be honored for in the future. If we didn't care about those things that we like, we wouldn't buy Hummers to get from the house -- from Highlands Ranch to the bank or something like that. But we do those things, and that's our prerogative.

I think we can also make decisions for the future just as John Kennedy did in 1961 when he chose to look at the future and think about what we could do differently than we did before instead of looking at the past and saying, "Nine years from now I want to be able to do the same thing we did bigger than ever and not change a thing about it."

I'd like to point out that -- I guess what I'd like to do is get into the technical aspect of the PEIS again, if I could, for just a second. And I'd like to say that it fails to meet its objectives on a few counts. One is consideration of environmental factors in its recommendations. The study is mandated by federal law to pay a lot of attention to the ecological, economic, and cultural environments of the area affected by the project.

And this study has got 3,000 pages, basically, doing that. And then the result of that study is that the most -- the solution with the highest environmental impacts would be the highway widening solution. And yet, at the end, all of the transit solutions -- or most of the transit solutions have been eliminated based on a \$4 billion threshold of the reasonableness that was arbitrarily established by Tom Norton who serves at the pleasure of the governor who has already decided and stated repeatedly that the solution to I-70 congestion will be highway widening. I contend that threshold is actually a filter designed to eliminate transit while allowing the governor's predetermined choice to remain.

Secondly, with the manner in which this addresses needs, I would like to address whose needs are really met by the preferred solution of highway widening. Will it be the traveler who will see no action for five years and then 15 years of construction slow down upon the completion of the project, seeing the same travel times that he has today only being four lanes wide traveling in one direction? What happens when the avalanche hits? What happens when the bad wreck comes? How many people do we have on the highway, and how long will they be sitting and waiting until it's cleared out this time?

Secondly, with regard to Clear Creek County businesses and residents, we will incur -- by the -- by your own report, damaged health environment, the damaged natural environment, damaged economy during construction, which is only 20 years -- which will only affect what I am able to leave my children. My estate is based on the appreciation of my real estate. The physical loss of real property that's wiped out, the loss of property values due to loss of viability as a bedroom community to commute to work and to the jobs and to different places, both east and west, increased travel times for business and personal purposes for 20 years -- which is a significant reduction in quality of life.

For Summit County, we see increased travel times for business and purple -- personal purposes -- purple -- personal purposes for 20 years as well. For Summit County businesses we see -- I've heard several references from corporations tonight regarding wanting to see a quick solution. The short-term solution we feel will be widening the highway.

I believe most engineering reports show that we can probably build transit faster than we can widen the highway. We have 20 years. I'm not sure what a 20-year project is going to do to the quarterly profits over the next few quarters. I don't think it's a quick, short-term solution. So whose needs are being met? Those who study, engineer, build and manage and maintain highways? Those who build and sell vehicles who use highways? Those who supply materials for the construction vehicles and the fuel for those vehicles?

In summation, while the industries affected by the solution recommended in the PEIS are valuable players, the maximization of their near-term profits must not be the sole factor in selection of the transportation solution which will affect the quality of life and the economic opportunities of all mountain residents for decades to come. Instead we should choose a more visionary long-range solution which respects the future of our children and their children and better respects the gift of the beauty of Colorado that keeps us all here.

Categorized Comment	310	Wheelock, Randall	Public	2/9/2005	<p>In 1859 George Jackson -- I can't read my notes because I lost my glasses yesterday. In 1850 George Jackson discovered gold in Idaho Springs. In 1971 Randy Wheelock drove into town on the way to Aspen because I was a petty upscale kid. I'd been to college, studied math and engineering. And I looked at Idaho Springs and spent my first night here and thought this place looks tough. I'm scared. I need to get out of this town fast. It was a pretty hard scabble place.</p> <p>There was a lot of cold smoke in there still and -- but, you know, I wasn't able to get anyplace that was upscale for me because my car burned too much oil and leaked too much automatic transmission fluid. And despite having been in college, I didn't know anything yet. So I couldn't even get over the pass to make it to Aspen where I would have been eaten alive in five minutes.</p> <p>Despite assertions that the PEIS, as mandated by law, has taken into consideration our environmental, economic, and our community or social health, I just don't really know why you bothered, because you chose to ignore it in the end. I don't know why you studied how badly this was going to affect our lives and reported to us in your own report of 3,000 pages, \$28 million, and thousands and thousands of professional hours studying this stuff to tell us that -- that those things are going to hurt us more in your own report, that the highway widening will hurt us more than the advanced guideway or the transit solutions, only to come down at the end and have Tom Norton admittedly stand there and say, "Well, let's just draw a line at \$4 billion and knock that stuff off the end. I can see that -- or I -- excuse me, I contend that that's evidence that this study has not met its mandated requirement to consider all of those factors."</p> <p>Furthermore, I'd like to say it's technically flawed, incomplete. And, as evidence, I'd like to offer a fact that sections of the report concluded that the AGS, as I've just stated, would cause less environmental and economic damage, and yet page 48 of the executive summary, it includes 30 percent contingency and 44 percent mitigation factors to be added to the hard cost of this project for all of the solutions. So we have the same amount of drainage and utilities, signing and striping, construction signs and traffic control, mobilization and right-of-way, utilities, forced account and environmental mitigation.</p> <p>Your own report states there's less environmental damage caused by AGS construction, and yet your same report attributes the same percentage to the hard costs, then attribute a higher hard cost to the AGS. So, therefore, attributes a higher dollar number to the AGS, despite the fact the same report says there's a lower environmental mitigation and lower environmental damage. How can it cost more to mitigate less damage?</p> <p>So I'm really surprised. I'm really surprised that 3,000 real pages -- it's not 1,500 pages -- 3,000 real 8-1/2-by-11 pages -- all of these thousands of hours, and \$28 million later and you guys couldn't even bother to break it out a little differently for each one of the solutions? I'm sorry. I just build houses, you know. But I studied enough math in high school to understand -- grade school to understand this is flawed.</p> <p>I'd also like to point out the hard cost -- Ed brought up a real important point a moment ago about the hard cost. He talked about the tunnels; he's right. I think there's a possibility that the AGS can go through and act like a plunger running through the top of the tunnel, and we don't have to drill another tunnel. That's a possibility. There are a lot of other solutions like running the AGS higher on the mountain through a shorter tunnel, and yet the hard cost of this has the exact same tunnel cost that the highway solution does.</p> <p>Furthermore, the AGS, I believe, includes full parking facilities and stations in its costs, if I'm not mistaken. And if it does, I want to know where the parking costs are for all cars that are going to be heading up there on these six lanes, because that's not even included. We're going to let the towns take care of that when they get there. So why don't you just pull that out and get a real effective true comparison of the two?</p> <p>The last thing I'd like to say is I don't think this is a short-term solution. I don't think it's a long-term solution. I don't think it's any kind of solution because the people that can't get up here now because they're complaining that feel -- we want to meet the needs of those people. Well, those people aren't going to get here any faster. They're going to get here slower for 20 years. And then it's going to be the same and it's going to get worse again. So it must not be meeting their need. It's not going to meet our need because it's going to destroy our environment, our social, and -- and physical environment.</p> <p>Furthermore, I guess I contend that the only needs that will be met will be those of the people who study highways, who engineer highways, who build highways, who manage highways, who build the cars to sell the cars to those who drive on the highways and who drill the oil to put inside the cars and run them up here. I think these are the only needs that are going to be met on any life cycling cost analysis by your selection.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	410	Wheelock, Randall	Public	2/26/2005	<p>My name is Randy Wheelock. I'm from Clear Creek County also. This is my fourth meeting I've attended.</p> <p>I would like to open by first of all thanking you guys for putting up with all of the emotion that you hear come out of people from Clear Creek County, including myself. I've heard repeatedly that my statements are emotional and entertaining. I'd like for them to be thought of as relevant, but I also understand those comments. And I hope you understand that because what is facing us, according to your own documents, is a little bit scary if you live there, that you would understand that we might be a little bit emotional about it and continue to endure us a little bit.</p>	Transcripts



And I want you to know that there's nothing personal meant towards anybody. I don't think there's a conspiracy among anybody sitting at these tables or anything like that. I know sometimes when we're racing hard to say things in three or five minutes, it's hard to spit all that out and be able to communicate that as well. We have very few speakers here today. If -- after the long introduction, if I run a little bit over, is it okay, or are we firm on this?

MICHELLE LI: Okay to finish. Go ahead.

RANDY WHELOCK: Okay. At the previous meetings, I'd just like to summarize some of the content of my previous statements very briefly as a preface to another comment I'd like to make. In my previous subject matter, I talked about four or five different subject areas.

One is the consideration of environmental factors in the recommendations of this report. This is a PEIS. That stands for Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. And the results of that statement on the environmental side showed significant environmental impact to varying degrees of virtually all of the alternatives.

The worst of those turn out to be the nine that are still on the table that have not been eliminated. But the inability to meet need or exceeding the \$4 billion cost of usability threshold, those are what remain. There doesn't seem to be any consideration given to environmental impact in the conclusions because the only highly impactful alternative that was eliminated was not eliminated because of its environmental impact but because of its extraordinary cost, which was the combination.

Another thing is our needs. This was suppose to discuss whose needs would be met. The travelers' needs, in my opinion, which include not only the people from Denver but the folks from Summit and Eagle and Grand County and Idaho Springs, we're all travelers too. Our needs are not met by this because what it really does -- it does nothing for five years, and for 15 years it gives us a worse situation while construction's going on, and then it returns to about where it is today and gets worse thereafter with the solely highway solution.

Clear Creek County businesses and residents, obviously, we've been talking about that. I don't need to go into that. The report acknowledges, and in informal discussions I've had on the floor after these meetings, your own folks and your own engineers have acknowledged, that we are not blowing smoke about this, that it is true that if the decision could be made solely on the impact of Clear Creek County it's a slam dunk. The impacts to our county will be much greater with highway widening than with, say, the AGS. And your own engineers have told me that in informal discussions.

Grand County residents and businesses, you'll incur the same kind of driving time slowdowns, not only for yourselves but for the impending customers that you hope to bring in here until 2025. I don't know how old you're going to be in 2025, but I'm going to be almost as old as Ed Rapp by then. So the people whose needs are being met are those who engineer and build and put cars and fuel cars on the highways primarily.

Furthermore -- and I won't go into it, but I've brought up several what I consider to be flaws in the AGS cost analysis in which costs are at an elevated level for that analysis. The CDOT responses on the floor that I've had and in informal conversations afterwards are that I'm emotional. I'm entertaining -- that's good. That's a good thing. I'm glad people are smiling -- and that I'm mistaken or uninformed about these things.

And some of these issues I've raised have been refuted. However, in subsequent conversations, most of them end up not being refuted and being acknowledged. I think that tells a little about bias. We're biased to save our community. We hate to be thought of as necessary collateral damage to be expended for the greater good of the even faster expansion of the economies of the most quickly expanding economies currently in the mountain communities already.

So I'm not sure where the need for those communities would stand at the highest possible rate to supersede our need to exist reasonably. I think that -- so we're biased about that. But I think that CDOT's a little biased too, which their responses to me on the floor tell me. They seem to regard all the kinds of statements that I've made as entertaining and emotional, but not substantive.

They seem to feel -- and they have said to me, what I've attacked a little bit, the cost analysis on the AGS, that those are just assumptions anyway. That we don't really know, it's unproven technology. And that makes me wonder how good the people who have done this analysis really are at taking care of that part of the report. I know they did the best they can, but I understand we haven't been doing it in this country, and it's hard to know.

There was an analogy made at the last meeting about John F. Kennedy. Somebody said, you know, we can widen that highway faster because John F. Kennedy said we can put people on the moon and we did it in one decade. And that's right.

But I think it's been kind of misappropriated because John F. Kennedy didn't say, Let's line up 50,000 horses side by side abreast at the Kansas border and ride them across Kansas slower than it's ever been done before. He said, Let's go to the moon with new technology, and we don't even know where the new technology's going to take us.

And I'll tell you where it's taken us. It's taken us to the GPSs we have today; it's taken us into the 21st century and the electronic age; it's taken us places we never dreamed when we just said, Let's just go to the moon.

And I think I remember that when we got to the moon the whole world was watching. The whole world's jaw dropped. The whole world looked at that as an amazing thing and admired the United States for what we had accomplished.

I have a dream. At a previous one of these meetings, Ed Rapp spoke of his dream, and afterwards he was laughed at a little bit as a guy that has a lot of dreams -- and people talked about it on the floor as though it wasn't really that important -- it was kind of goofy what he said. So in honor of Ed Rapp, I'd like to tell you what my dream is.

I dream of people checking their baggage in Madrid and flying into DIA and getting on a bullet train and flying 100 miles an hour at times and places through the snowcapped mountains to Vail or to any of the ski areas -- not any, because you can't get to Winter Park, obviously, that way -- we can talk about that otherwise.

We'll take people off the highway so they can get here easier. And I envision them getting there and getting their skis and their baggage off right away. I think they can get their toys there. I envision cargo pods like UPS and FedEx and AirExpress, and people like that.

Instead of having a UPS truck coming up for multiple deliveries, I envision pods that are modular and can come off and be loaded onto trucks also that can be loaded on and take the place of personnel carriers on the AGS so that we can get some of that loaded cargo off the highway and get it to places even faster. And since we have to have stations, I imagine those stations having facilities to handle that as well.

You know, I imagine bullet pods flying through the ventilation tunnel of the Eisenhower Tunnel precluding the need to drill another tunnel and taking that cost out of the AGS, and, in fact, enhancing the ventilation by acting as a plunger through the tunnel. And I envision and I dream that when we accomplish that the whole world looks at us and says, Wow, Colorado is the state that finally took the United States into the 21st century in transportation technology.

I'd like to just repeat a summation that I made at the last -- it's very poorly printed because the other day I was walking down a slick driveway and my feet flew out from under me. I was talking on my cell phone, not watching where I was going and I fell on my laptop and smashed it and my printer, which was some kind of weird karma for the technologically obsessed, but, anyway -- so this didn't print very well.

In summation, I would like to repeat my closing words from the last meeting. While the industries which benefit from the solution recommended in the PEIS, the highway solution, are valuable players, the maximization of their near-term province must not be the sole factor in the selection of the transportation solution which will affect the quality of life and economic opportunities of all mountain residents for decades to come.

Instead we should choose a more visionary long-range solution which respects the future of our children and their children and better respects the gift of the beauty of Colorado that keeps us all here to begin with.

Thank you.

Categorized Comment	627	Whelock, Randall	Public	5/25/2005	The following comments are submitted in the context of Environmental Justice (EJ), and its implications in the elimination of certain alternatives from consideration in the I-70 Programmatic Impact Statement (PEIS). In addition, the issue of the reasonableness of cost will also be addressed.	Online
---------------------	-----	------------------	--------	-----------	--	--------

The issues:

U.S. Executive Order (EO) 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-income Populations, dated February 11, 1994, specifically addresses the requirement of all federal agencies to consider EJ in all Federal Actions, presumably including all EIS studies mandated to comply with the Environmental Protection Act. Among those citizens eligible for consideration under this EO are Low Income populations, defined as "any readily identifiable group of low-income persons who live in geographic proximity", and "a person whose median household income

is at or below the Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines".

Under the Environmental Protection Act, cost may be considered as a factor in evaluating alternatives an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The history of the PEIS:

In the PEIS several needs are identified including, among others, safety, travel demand, and economic growth.

To date, all alternatives screened out in the PEIS are those deemed least environmentally and economically damaging to Clear Creek communities, while those left under consideration are the most damaging in both cases.

Two arbitrary thresholds, need (for a 25 year projection) and cost (an arbitrary \$4 billion cap), have been used to eliminate those no longer under consideration.

The arguments:

1) Environmental Justice

Without doubt, the populations of Clear Creek County have a disproportionately high level of residents below poverty level, relative to their neighboring counties.

Those neighboring counties' need for economic growth is a paramount consideration in this project. As evidence I offer that the Minimal Action Alternative, one of the least environmentally damaging, has been eliminated in the PEIS solely due to its inability to meet need, despite the fact that it meets 98% of the 25 year travel demand at a much lower cost than those alternatives still under consideration. This is also despite the fact that this alternative also meets the safety needs of the study. The only criteria by which Minimal Action falls short is its inability to meet peak travel demand. The implication of this decision is that the inability to meet peak travel demand is the highest priority. Since this peak travel demand is a very short transitory period, and is of primary importance only to the economies of the resort communities, it seems to be prioritized solely for the purpose of meeting those communities "needs" for economic growth.

Left in place are those alternatives which are deemed most damaging to the ecological environment, the human health and the economy of Clear Creek County.

The implications of this prioritization are clear, and I ask that the PEIS readdress the definition of need in the following context:

Why does the "need" to maximize the acceleration of the economic growth of our already fastest growing mountain communities supersede the "need" of their poorer neighbors to maintain even a minimal quality of life?

2) Reasonableness of cost

The \$4 billion maximum threshold of cost appears to be designed to deliberately screen out all viable transit solutions from consideration. As evidence I offer the following:

Circumstance

Governor Bill Owens is on the record that he wants highway, not transit, solutions.

Tom Norton is on the record that the \$4 billion threshold is "his number", and he's sticking to it.

The \$4 billion threshold has eliminated all transit alternatives (except "Bus in Guideway", a 6-lane solution), while leaving all highway solutions under consideration.

Chronology

According to Summit County Commissioner Bill Wallace, in a statement at the April 21st meeting of the I-70 Coalition in Frisco, Colorado, an unnamed CDOT employee told him that the \$4 billion cap was created by "doubling the cost of the basic highway alternative". If true, this indicates that the alternatives' costs were known when the cost threshold was established. If so, Mr. Norton would likely have known that he was effectively eliminating transit alternatives with his decision.

I respectfully submit that the PEIS and CDOT should reconsider their conclusions, and adopt a more flexible view of alternatives which offer less egregious damage to our human and ecological environments. I further suggest that the study should also expand its planning to encompass a longer life cycle cost analysis into its vision.

Toward that end I urge that the PEIS should adopt the model put forward today by the Interstate 70 Central Mountain Transportation Corridor Coalition.

Randall P. Wheelock

Categorized Comment	760	Wheelock, Randall	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion). Build mass transit - bus guideway, rail or monorail (\$3.3-6.2 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>The mass transit would be one critical focus of the long term strategy. Others include travel demand and alternate routes. The minimal action should be enhanced beyond its current PEIS task list, and accelerated to earliest possible implementation. Randy Wheelock Wheelock Const. Co, P.O. Box 952 Idaho Springs, CO 80452 Clear Creek resident Summit County businessperson who desires long range vision and sustainable, uninterrupted economic growth for Summit County, which will benefit all businesses, including my own.</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	805	White, Jim	Public	1/12/2005	<p>Preliminary Partial Response to I-70 PEIS</p> <p>The report that was made public about a month ago is massive. I have only begun to read through and digest it. I certainly hope that the time frame for public comment can be extended beyond the 90 days, so that the public input can be as reasonable and constructive as possible.</p> <p>Nevertheless, there is some input I can offer after only a preliminary assessment of the report.</p> <p>First, there is a serious flaw in the planning horizon. The improvements in transportation are targeted to meet demand in 2025. Yet, construction is planned to continue until 2025. Thus, we will have many years of construction, during which time service levels will be worse than they are today—and yet the resulting highway in 2025 may not provide any improvement in terms of peak travel times and peak congestion hours over year 2000 levels. Residents and visitors will have no other option than to sit in traffic during peak periods as they do today. A "Preferred" alternative should meet the anticipated travel demand for a longer timeframe. Clearly, the study needs to consider a planning horizon significantly longer than the basic construction period.</p> <p>Second, there are some aspects that could affect Tier 1 decisions about which approach to take, that are deferred to Tier 2. Chief among these appear to be construction impact, an aspect that is only vaguely assessed for each of the alternatives, and seems to have no impact on the screening of alternatives. Alternatives with some of the heaviest impact seem to have made it into the "preferred" list, while some of the least impactful alternatives have not. Given the extremely long 15 to 20 year construction period, construction impact needs serious consideration. This is a serious flaw, as it could lead to the choice of a wrong general approach.</p> <p>In all, the report is a good start, but it needs some fundamental revisions.</p>	Accompaniments to Oral Comments
Categorized Comment	120	White, Jim	Public	1/12/2005	<p>I'm Jim White. I'm a neighbor here. I live right up Floyd Hill. I wanted to say that this is very impressive. In the last month I've had a good chance to take a good look at it, and boy, is it massive. I certainly hope that you will consider extending the time beyond 90 days so the public has a chance to really understand all the good work that's gone into it so we can, in fact, give you the best, highest-quality input to keep us moving forward.</p> <p>I only started to look at it, and there's some good input I can provide tonight. And first, I think there's a bit of a flaw in the planning horizon, the improvements in transportation -- are targeted to meet demand in 2025, or shortly thereafter. Yet in many of the alternatives, the construction will proceed up through that period to 2025. There is good consideration of what life would be like after the construction's complete, but there's very little information about the period that we're going to have to endure between now and the time the construction process is finished.</p> <p>So we face a period where we'll get the same traffic, much worse than it is today, for a long period. And</p>	Transcripts

shortly after it's done, it's going to be obsolete. We will have passed the limits. It seems to me that a longer planning horizon is necessary, both to consider the impact of what's going on and to fairly judge among the alternatives.

That's one thought.

A second thought is, that as I look at what's in Tier I and Tier II, there's some important information for deciding among alternatives that has been deferred to Tier II and I can't find in the report. Chief among these seems to be the construction impacts. Some of the alternatives with the highest impact seem to be preferred, and some of the alternatives with the lowest impacts seem not to be preferred. Obviously, this wasn't taken into account in this stage.

Again, the extremely long construction period. I think we need to -- all in all, I think it's a good start in the report, but there's some changes that need to be made.

Thanks a lot.

Categorized Comment	197	Wieger, Jim	Public	2/17/2005	<p>From my first impression of the proposed alternatives, it becomes clear that the overall objectives are very short-sighted in that building more lanes will not solve the problem of too many cars on the highway. Widening the existing road will only cause more people to travel by car until the congestion reaches the current situation. Not enough research has been done to judge the overall impacts both financially and technically of an advanced guideway system. The objective should be to substantially eliminate cars not encourage them.</p> <p>The construction of a wider highway will devastate the economy of Clear Creek County because people will not want to settle in a construction zone for fifteen years and many will move out. This will have a ripple effect with sagging enrollment in the school district and subsequent loss of funding. Businesses will be forced to close and those people will leave.</p> <p>No mention has been made of generating a funding source from those who will profit the most from increased conveyance along the corridor-THE RESORTS-! If funding can be obtained from these sources then the higher cost longer-term alternatives can be considered.</p> <p>Do not widen the highway.....look to the future (and Europe)</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	94	Williams, Bruce	Public	1/29/2005	<p>I can understand why you are looking at widening I-70. In certain respects it would be the least cost option. Although another tunnel will be very expensive, and closure problems will still persist from snow, overturned trucks, etc. In addition, widening I-70 is certainly not a popular option with the mountain communities.</p> <p>I also believe that a mass transit option is getting the cart ahead of the horse. The congestion of I-70 is not from people landing at DIA and driving to the mountains. It is due to the front range population explosion extending from Fort Collins to Colorado Springs. If mass transit is to work these people must first be transported via a north/south system that would interchange with an east/west system into the mountains. These systems could be light rail, monorail, etc., but there must be ample parking and/or a bus feeder system to take people to the mass transit system. In order to work and be used the system must be convenient and economical. This probably also means a continued tax subsidy of some sort. There is not another light rail system in the world that is not tax supported. Colorado presents some other unique challenges in that riders of a mass transit here would also need to take their mountain toys.</p> <p>In light of the above, has anyone seriously considered upgrading HWY 285 into a controlled access alternate route? A spur into Summit County over Boreas pass would move a lot of the congestion from I-70, and avoid the tunnel. I don't think snow slides would be a major problem with Boreas pass, and as an old railroad route it has fairly wide turns and an easy grade. Maybe not a perfect solution, but it might be more cost effective to at least by-pass the tunnels.</p> <p>Thank you, Bruce Williams</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	210	Williams, Marie-Claude	Public	2/9/2005	<p>I am in favor of AGS it will create the least amount of disturbance to the ecology, our water resources our health (during and after construction) it will not only provide transportation to the Colorado (Denver, Sbiens and I-70 residents) but it will be an American as well as a world wide attraction - people will come to Colorado just to ride the train and admire the beautiful scenery at the same time - people who enjoy a drink after skiing will be able to do so, thereby reducing the amount of DUIs and increasing the sales tax revenues for the state (from Bars and restaurant sales)</p> <p>GOVERNOR OWEN: public transportation works and it is profitable - I grew up with it and people from all walks of life ride the train, it is safe, quiet, and relaxing, enjoyable, beautiful to look at and as the population increases you just add trains to the rail.</p> <p>I hope you will listen to the people of Clear Creek County whose life you are about to destroy.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	55	West Denver Trout Unlimited	Associations & Special Interest Groups	1/12/2005	<p>12 January 2005</p> <p>David A Nicol Division Administrator FH WA 12300 West Dakota Avenue Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Tom Norton Executive Director Colorado Department of Transportation 4201 E. Arkansas Avenue Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Dear Messrs Nicol and Norton:</p> <p>RE: Draft I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>I was recently appointed Director of the Clear Creek initiative of West Denver Trout Unlimited. I have not yet gotten satisfactorily up to speed on the large number of issues I must master to help lead our effort to establish a quality fishery on significant parts of Clear Creek. However, from what I have been told by a number of experts intimately familiar with water quality circumstances on the Clear Creek drainage, and from what I know personally of the extremely fragile ecology of the stream at present, your proposed PEIS for I-70 expansion, as it now stands, is ruinously deficient in providing explicit safeguards for the condition of Clear Creek during the presumed construction period 2010-2025.</p> <p>It is quite likely that we will strenuously oppose any plans for widening or related projects on I-70 through the Clear Creek corridor if we are not satisfied that specific, scientifically defensible safeguards to avoid further contamination of this body of water are not set forth prior to the initiation of work, and followed thereafter. If you are not prepared to do so at this point, I would urge you to defer on furtherance of the public commentary process until such time as you are prepared to do so, since the particulars of those safeguards will be crucial to the inherent viability of your I-70 project.</p> <p>Miles D. Williams, Ph. D. Director, Clear Creek Initiative West Denver Trout Unlimited</p> <p>(303) 980-1322 14234 W. Center Drive Lakewood CO 80228</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	511	Williamson, Rick	Public	3/26/2005	<p>March 26, 2005</p> <p>Jean Wallace, P.E. Senior Operations Engineer Federal Highways Administration 12300 West Dakota Ave. Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Re: Comments on the 1-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Wallace:</p> <p>As a landowner with property adjacent to I-70 between MP 244 and 245, I object to one of the Alternatives discussed in the above-cited Draft PEIS. More specifically, I object to the Alternative titled "Six-Lane Highway 65 mph", as this Alternative would involve installation of the "Floyd Hill Tunnel", which would have the negative impact of significantly devaluing my residential property, and potentially</p>	Written

negatively affecting my household water supply (via my groundwater well).

Thanks for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

Rick L. Williamson  
1647 Elk Valley Drive  
Evergreen, CO 80439

Categorized Comment	582	Wilson, Mary	Public	1/26/2005	<p>(1) Monorail system isn't going to work in the mountains - its unproven and too costly. Where it's really needed is I-25 corridor especially between Fort Collins and Denver. That's a clear death trap. what weekend skier, second homeowner going to use it? None. Can't you see the mountain residents going to Denver for Costco or Sam's and bringing their supplies back? I can't!</p> <p>(2) There is a very simple logical solution! Build a new interstate going southwest from Denver through Alamosa or Pagosa! That part of the state could use the economic impact, it would divert the cross country travelers and truckers from I-70. What cross country traveler will spur-of-the-moment stop to spend a week in Aspen, Vail, or Summit County to go skiing? None! With the 5+ year study plus cost of blowing up mountains, drilling bores, filling in Clear Creek, condemning land could be spent building another interstate. People coming up to enjoy the high country are getting away from the 8 lanes of traffic of Miami, NY, Houston, and LA, not to see 8 lanes of concrete up here! So go southwest young men!</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	567	Wilson, Robert	Public	5/23/2005	<p>More Comments by Bob Wilson After writing comments submitted May 22, I have been thinking more about the subjects of right-of-ways (ROWs), civil infrastructure, and pollution. Professionally I have worked for over 25 years as an electrical power systems engineer, familiar with transporting electrical energy, the not-in-my-back-yard (NIMBY) syndrome and other issues.</p> <p>An ideal transit project though the I-70 mountain corridor would have six lanes of high speed highway and facilities for mass transit in two directions. However, I-70 is very constricted in places. Elected officials along this corridor have recommended adding highways lanes in strategic portions, keeping I-70 at its present four lanes in places, and planning for mass transit. My railroad friends may disagree, but I believe mass transit could operate with one track where needed in narrow sections of the corridor. Examples of where we need the leave the highway at four lanes and add one track would be around historic Georgetown and Silver Plume and a future Eisenhower rail tunnel (or shared highway-rail tunnel) under our Colorado Continental Divide.</p> <p>For purposes of discussion, let us assume commuter rail, that meets the FRA crash withstand specification, is the preferred alternative. For the distances involved electrically-powered light rail technology is too expensive. With such technology, we should study and optimize the operation of commuter rail that operates on two tracks where the ROW is wide enough, but slims down to a single track where needed. With modern operating controls and GPS locational safeguards, commuter rail can be operated in a very safe manner, much safer than driving a car. Even if commuter rail were constructed with longer stretches of single-track, it may be possible to add short "passing sidings."</p> <p>The issue of pollution should be considered in the narrow valleys that make up the I-70 mountain corridor. Modern diesel-powered (or other fuels) commuter rail technology will reduce pollution as compared with the equivalent number of automobiles.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	540	Wilson, Robert	Public	5/22/2005	<p>Comments on the I-70 Mountain Corridor Robert E. Wilson 11480 West 66th Place Arvada, Colorado</p> <p>I fully agree with the position of 31 mountain communities as reported in the Denver post on May 18, 2005 – expend I-70 at key segments and plan for mass transit. After the TREX and other construction projects, we should "build it once." The citizens of Clear Creek and other counties along I-70 should only have to suffer through massive construction once. As discussed in the Denver Post article, we should add highway lanes in the area mentioned. In my opinion, we should plan for a future mass transit right-of-way (ROW). A ROW for mass transit is key- move the dirt and bore the tunnels for future transit during the initial construction phase. After funding is found, transit can be added with much less disruption to people living along I-70.</p> <p>I agree with the decision not to build a futuristic monorail system. I recommend we study using conventional commuter rail technology. Colorado's own Colorado Railcar has stated one or two of their Diesel Multiple Units (DMUs) could negotiate moderate grades associated with a commuter rail project. This claim needs to be investigated.</p> <p>An issue is why CDOT capped the project cost at \$4B? Lately the citizens of Colorado have shown they will tax themselves when they see the benefit. An option would be to build transit on the "east end" as recommended for the initial highway work. The transit could end (temporarily) at a Park-n-Ride lot west of Floyd Hill, thus easing traffic over this bottleneck. The Park-n-Ride could be permanent or temporary.</p> <p>We all know that we cannot build enough highway lanes to prevent future congestion. Careful planning with subject the people living along I-70 to only one massive project. The Denver metropolitan area has only two corridors for travel to the west- I-70 and US 285. These limited resources must be used in an efficient and environmentally friendly way in a way where the traveling public ahs choices.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	486	Wilson, Tom	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Colorado needs a transportation plan for future access to the mountains. What is being proposed is about a road. It will not solve the long term needs of Colorado and its visitors. To do that we need multiple access points along the front range westward like I-70. That allows more of Colorado to absorb future traffic and participate in future growth. Forcing it all down I-70 ensures the failure of this project to solve Colorado's future needs. It will soon fill up again and we will still have no significant route westward but I-70. For now take care of the bottlenecks that significantly slow traffic on I-70 and focus on a transportation plan. That plan will include multiple routes west at a minimum. It will not be focused entirely on one road. As Colorado Springs, Denver and points north grow closer together, multiple access points west just makes more sense.</p>	Form
Categorized Comment	288	Winchell, Michael	Public	2/9/2005	<p>Well, I mean, I personally think this really doesn't matter because you guys are going to do what you want to do. You don't care about Clear Creek County. It's a small county and our needs -- you don't care about our needs. And that's basically my opinion. And, you know, I think that this is just been a big pushover.</p> <p>I've looked at all the stuff at the high school. I didn't stay to hear the spiel or whatever, but, you know, I think a lot of stuff is overlooked and ignored. Like our Clear Creek is going to be ruined, a lot of the historic stuff, you know, and that is just -- you know, it's us suffering for the bigger cause, which is -- I guess, is going to happen.</p> <p>That's really I all I have to say. I'm sure you've heard that a bunch of times. I won't go into the historical and environmental because I really don't know. And I'm a new homeowner in the county, and I think that this isn't going to be good for my property values in the short term, which is the way that I look at it.</p> <p>And, you know, it's just not in the best interests of the county. It may be in the best interest of people who drive I-70 a lot. Okay.</p>	Transcripts
Categorized Comment	500	Winter, Rick	Counties	5/15/2005	<p>I'm very concerned how education will be impacted by the expansion of lanes through Clear Creek county. How are our teachers going to get here? How are we going to keep and attract good teachers if they get stuck in traffic? We have declining enrollment as it is. How are we going to handle the outflow of families when jobs decline as a result of declining property values, lost space, transportation hangups etc. of both the construction phase and the aftermath? How long will children be stuck on our buses and how will it impact their learning?</p> <p>Rick Winter Vice President Clear Creek County School Board</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	466	Wolfat, Bryan	Public	3/17/2005	<p>Title: Has Colorado has Missed the Boat, Water and Dock?</p> <p>Colorado is a place of beauty filled with various plants and wild life. Like most creatures on this earth, the local wildlife manages to prosper without polluting, gouging landscapes, or introducing non-native plants. Local wildlife gets from one place to another without adversely affect their surroundings. In addition, the activities of local wildlife benefit the land. For example, beavers create wetlands for birds and larger animals like moose. In turn, water is slowed and seeps into very deep mountain and valley</p>	Written

aquifers. Then more rocky-mountain water gradually seeps to the lower elevations to feed streams and prairie habitats 100's of miles away. This system works efficiently. We'll be used to work well. Then, man entered into the picture and eventually disrupted the natural cycles. Dams and roadways are cut into the mountains and plains. In turn, salt and gravel from popular roads choke and sterilize once healthy streams and rivers.

I'm a Colorado Native and lived there for about 33 years. During that time, I've seen much damage done and often grieve over how 'rampant' progress has made my state look. It's become less attractive, very expensive, and travel is increasingly hazardous. T-Rex and other widening projects expand the freeways into giant strips of worn concrete and asphalt. The resulting traffic, blast out noise at jet engine levels. The resulting plume from gasoline engines and pulverized gravel pollutes the air, water and peoples lungs. But... is wider better? A wider path is not the logical solution for getting from here-to-there. Why is that? Other countries have set very high standards when it comes to travel. For example, London and France have the 'chunnel' for cars and people. Local folks and tourists travel back and forth under the English Channel in a single train! The Scandinavian and Baltic States have incredibly nice trains and other mass transit systems that move people freely. Japan has the Bullet Train, subways and light rail in place to safely transport folks to work without a car. In Colorado, there are some of these things. However, it seems to be a token effort. Is Colorado and the rest of the country falling behind? Can Colorado improve when it comes to mountain transportation? Greedy oil magnates and auto companies have fueled traffic deaths and pollution. Yes, one of the big three auto companies had a hand in dismantling trolley cars in major US cities. Trolley cars were economical and safe.

So, what encompasses Colorado's transportation system? Yes, there's T-Rex and the limited Light rail system. And some folks are using them. The light rail is a good start. However, it really falls short of a statewide comprehensive system. How so? For example, major highways and of course roads are adversely affected by weather (snow, sleet and rain). Concrete and blacktop covers Colorado Soil, then another layer of soil (gravel/salt) is applied. The result is a proven recipe for disaster on Colorado roads. Most drivers are from out of state and often lack the skills for driving in slick conditions...especially the arteries that connect various ski areas. Europe has one of the best train systems in the world. When it's snowing and slick, a skier or snowboarder can still spend the Euros for a lift ticket, dining and maybe a night lodging. No matter what the weather conditions, small children to senior citizens can travel potentially hazardous roads, and spend money at many ski resorts and towns. In turn, this builds personal and financial connections with neighboring towns. Certainly this would be better than being stuck on I-70 or I-25 for hours or days. I costs everyone time, money while the highway patrol has to clean up and accident left by Car, SUV or Semi truck driver. I know of dozens of skilled, honest Coloradans that have moved or don't ski any more because of the real dangers and hassles to go skiing. Personally, I've enjoyed skiing much more, now that I'm the far Southwest. Even though the drive is longer, we're able to afford and NOT have a good powder day, wiped out by the frustrated drivers and grid locked roads. Many former Colorado folks have skied Brian Head, Snowbowl and Sunrise Resorts. It's great. It's like skiing used to be. In addition, veteran skiers and boarders don't have to pay for parking. And there are a number of former newscasters, skilled professionals... and many good folks down here. A few of them used to live in the corridor between Fort Collins to Colorado Springs. This travel corridor between the two is well known. Yes, you could say I'm saddened by what I've seen in Colorado for the past 10 plus years. Most of the information I've been collecting is pointing to a transportation system that's engineered and built with 'hope' but not with the long-term health of the environment and people in mind. Are wider streets and highways the solution? Not if it's connected to inventions that pollute the air and water. The 'brown cloud' could be a subject of the past, if we honestly build a real mass transit system. It will take time, funds and energy. However, if the people of Colorado are unable, who is?

What could be the result of a rail system linking all the major Colorado Cities and vacation destinations? Skilled and talented workers would be more likely to stay in Colorado and have a part in making this state more attractive. International skiers and vacationers that visit could travel to Colorado resorts without a car or being stuck in a pile-up. Large companies would be more likely to stay and recognize that their employees would stay as well. What's is one of the most important infrastructures of any city? Yes, it's the way folks get from here-to-there. At this time almost every thing is based on the car. A person can roll from their driveway to a variety of Colorado resorts and vacation destinations. However, will the motorist make there in a timely manner, or will they get stuck in some front-range city or town? Will they get stuck in the western slope, while attempting to get back home? The question remains, who needs a rail system in the mountains and plains of Colorado. Most 'transplants' in Colorado don't, because they think it's only for winter activities? However, this would be a false assumption. The European Union does have an excellent rail system, and will continue to meet the needs of its visitors and local people. At this time, many nations in Europe are currently selling off their billions of dollar assets for the Euro currency. It being seen the new currency for International Central Banks and is gaining in value against the dollar. Why? Because of the 360 plus billion US deficit... nations are seeing the dollar slip in worldwide markets. The trend is not because of nerves, but on facts. The US is structured and seen by the international community as risky investment. In part, we haven't invested in ideas that have real safety and efficiency in mind. By building a clean transportation base that will benefit us now and into the future, Colorado could enhance it's local economy and be a very good example for the rest of the nation. Being hooked on import oil, gas guzzlers and big meals only makes us more susceptible to failure and financial collapse. Our mountain environment would suffer as well.

Colorado needs to take the initiative and show the rest of the country, that our money needs to be invested and spent wisely. Any transportation takes planning and time...at least a sincere effort could be made to build a 'clean-running' transportation system. You've heard of ABC (always buy Colorado)? What can you truly buy in Colorado and hope they'll be there, a year or two from now. We need to build a 'clean' transportation system now. If we don't know where to start... please ask you neighbors in Europe and Japan...yes, ask for help...before it's truly too late.

Enclosed is one drawing of a electric, solar assisted a monorail system. It's a conceptual design for use in any setting. This idea could link folks from the mountains to the plains and de-clog Colorado's highways. I have more drawings that would give you all the details to build a small segment of a rail or monorail system, then you could expand it to link mountain towns. Really appreciate your time.

Best Regards,  
Brian "Wolfat"  
Colorado Native  
Skier & Snowboarder & Self Taught Engineer

Categorized Comment	620	Woods, Sarah	Public	5/25/2005	It is important to put very long and careful thought into the changes that will be made to the I-70 corridor b/w Denver and Vail. This road is the heart of the tourist industry that fuels the Colorado economy as a whole, this road is very powerful. Every community in Colorado must be listened to about their concerns. I think of the old road that went through Georgetown and up the switch backs- Georgetown was the epicenter of apre' ski before I-70 went up the side of the canyon, by-passing the town altogether. If this was good or bad, it is hard to say, but one thing is for sure, things changed. I attended one of the public churert and I came away with this- There needs to be more time and thought put into this decision. All of the alternatives need to be looked at with equal weight no matter what the current projected cost. I felt that CDOT threw away the monorail idea right away because of the cost and the cost only. It seems that CDOT already favored the "adding more lanes alternative" because it is easy and quick. I believe adding more lanes will only lead to health, environmental and economic concerns for all residents of Clear Creek county AND the lanes will fill up and we will again be searching for a better answer to the traffic congestion. Let alone, how will the wildlife EVER get across that ocean of lanes without more fatalities. I would like CDOT to seriously consider the monorail option and incorporate a bus system or car park at each station. This may be the riskiest and most expensive option because it involves a cultural change in the mindset of travelers. But, it can move people to and from the mountains in mass quantities, it can be placed above the ground allowing wildlife and rivers to move freely and it does not emit as much air pollution. I dare CDOT and the Federal Highway Administration to think deep into the future and to really make a move that is going to make a positive difference in Colorado. Look at the example that the European Alps can give us as far as transportation in the mountains- they have a longer history with train use than we do.	Online
Categorized Comment	689	Worth, Bill	Public	5/24/2005	Received by telephone, May 24, 2005:  Hello, Jean Wallace, I am...this is Bill Worth. I live up at Bakerville on I-70, and I was calling in regard to I-70 widening, putting in six lanes.  And the thing that was interesting to me is that I-70 actually stops at the Utah border with Colorado so that Colorado would be the main receiver of all the improvements and so on, but it doesn't really... it goes through Utah as I-50, and 6 and 50, I guess, and it doesn't go anyplace once you get to I-15, which goes south and goes into southern California.  It seems to me a better way would be to widen and improve I-40 going over Berthoud Pass and eventually put a tunnel through the area at Berthoud as opposed to enlarging the tunnel and increasing the transportation flow on one highway 70, on one highway, as opposed to having two major highways going through the state, which certainly makes a lot more sense to do, I think, than to widen the...make a six-lane out of I-70 going up through the tunnel, etc.  And it's my understanding that even the people in Vail have put in their request that we not, that the traffic noise and various other problems with that highway that runs right through their valley is not a preferable situation for them, which is interesting because it was thought that they were the instigators of all the widening business so that they could get more skiers, I guess, but that certainly doesn't seem to be the case.  Anyhow that's my consideration and being at the Bakerville interchange I'm concerned because I'm the one on the north side of the highway, and I understand they are going to have to have an interchange there, but I hope they don't blast anymore because the last time that was widened and the bridge was	Phone Record

put in it knocked down my house up there, and I had to completely rebuild it, so I'd hate to have that happen again.

Thank you very much.

My number here is 303-741-1974.  
And the address is 6164 South Ash Circle East,  
Littleton, Colorado, or Centennial if you prefer, 80121

Any information about that interchange there at Bakerville would be quite helpful to me. Thank you. Bye,  
Bye.

Categorized Comment	702	Yarosh, Andrew	Public	5/18/2005	<p>1. Which alternative do you favor regarding I-70 expansion?</p> <p>Minimal action + create long-term transportation strategy (\$1.3 billion)</p> <p>2. Please write your comments here and include your name, e-mail address and physical Colorado address.</p> <p>No response</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	587	Young, Frank	Public	5/24/2005	<p>I urge that you carefully review and adopt the "Regionally Preferred Alternative" provided by the I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition.</p> <p>Thank you, Frank Young</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	671	Clear Creek County Open Space	Counties	5/20/2005	<p>Clear Creek County Open Space Post Office Box 2000 Georgetown, CO 80444 (303) 679-2305</p> <p>May 20, 2005</p> <p>Ms. Cecilia Joy, Project Manager Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1 18500 East Colfax Avenue Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>These comments are to be included in the Administrative Record for the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Project M 0703-244</p> <p>Dear Ms. Joy,</p> <p>The Clear Creek County Open Space Commission (CCCOSC) has serious concerns regarding the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). Thoughtful consideration and response to these concerns will be greatly appreciated.</p> <p>Established by a vote of the people in 1999, Clear Creek County residents approved a one mill property levy to support an open space commission dedicated to creating and preserving open space, recreation, and the unique historic character of their community. With the tireless effort of its volunteer commission, and a small operating budget just sufficient enough to provide for one part-time staffer and leverage grants, CCCOSC is in the process of developing significant recreational opportunities identified by the Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030 to improve its quality of life and local economy.</p> <p>As you know, The Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030 adopted January 21, 2004, identifies the development of the Clear Creek Greenway as a specific objective on page 2-2. In a previous letter to Mr. Kullman dated December 4, 2003, CCCOSC asked for project support from CDOT towards the development of the Clear Creek Greenway Plan remarking, "The project will be an important planning tool not only for the County, but for CDOT and future highway development." In a follow-up letter from Mr. Kullman, dated February 2, 2004, CDOT generously agreed to participate and contribute to the effort.</p> <p>CCCOSC has greatly appreciated, and applauds, CDOT's participation in the development of the Clear Creek Greenway Plan. However, despite CDOT's awareness and participation in the development of this plan, there is no specific mention of its development in the I-70 Mountain Corridor Draft PEIS under the Land Use Section "3.10.2.5 Clear Creek County." Likewise, the greenway is only referenced in its conceptual form as the "Greenway Initiative" in regards to the Clear Creek Master Plan 2030 under section "3.14.2 Recreation Resources."</p> <p>CCCOSC is currently scheduled to complete the development of the Clear Creek Greenway Plan in July of 2005, which will include planning for a continuous bike trail and associated river-oriented recreational facilities along the entire stretch of Clear Creek within the County. Since the plan is expected to provide the basic groundwork investment leading to significant economic and social improvements, considering the limiting terrain in this County, impacts to the Greenway Plan should be considered as a part of the Tier 1 PEIS process. Without proper evaluation of the environmental, cultural and construction impacts of all proposed PEIS alternatives to the Clear Creek Greenway Plan during the Tier 1 PEIS process, economic, social, and recreational investments identified as priorities in the Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030 run the risk of being adversely affected, or prematurely precluded from future implementation.</p> <p>CCCOSC further requests that as an early action item, CDOT construct the Clear Creek Greenway as soon as possible for a) mitigation of future highway improvements, b) emergency access, and c) to provide for mobility and safety during highway construction by providing a multi-modal corridor through Clear Creek County.</p> <p>Again, thoughtful consideration and response to these concerns will be greatly appreciated. Clear Creek County and its Open Space Commission look forward to working with the Colorado Department of Transportation to develop a corridor that sufficiently addresses various regional and local quality of life initiatives, while meeting the travel demands of the future.</p> <p>Sincerely, Frank Young, Chairman Clear Creek County Open Space Commission</p>	Written
Categorized Comment	102	Younglund, Diane	Public	2/2/2005	<p>I don't have time to read all of your plans, so I don't know if you have already included these ideas in your plans. First, I am aware of the high wildlife/vehicle accidents on the highway. There is an especially dangerous section where the road crosses a migration/traveling route for wildlife. I would like your plans to include passages so that the wildlife can safely cross the highway. I would like you to include well researched information regarding the design and placement of these passages.</p> <p>Another idea: When I was in Switzerland, I was amazed at how they made "double-decker" highways through the mountains. I would like to see more of that, because it enables more volume with less environmental damage to the mountains.</p> <p>Thank-you.</p>	Online
Categorized Comment	400	Yust, Jim	Public	2/26/2005	<p>From Jim Yust Box 246 Kremmling, Colorado 80459</p> <p>To CDOT C/O J. F. Sato and Associates 5898 South Rapp Street Littleton, Colorado 80120</p> <p>Cecelia Joy CDOT Region 1 18500 East Colfax Ave. Aurora, Colorado 80011</p> <p>Jean Wallace, P. E. Senior operations Engineer Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Ave. Lakewood, Colorado 80228</p> <p>To whom it may concern, regarding the Draft PEIS for the I-70 Mountain Corridor:</p> <p>Regarding SMV's (Slow Moving Vehicles):</p> <p>At present there are many SMV's on steep grades in this area, including Vail Pass, Eisenhower Tunnels, Georgetown hill and Floyd Hill/MT. Vernon Canyon. How will SMV's operate if you have a</p>	Form

minimum speed limit of 50? They cannot climb the hills at this speed and going down at this speed would be extremely dangerous. There are already restrictions in places for maximum speed 30 for descending heavy trucks. As you know well, speed limits are a maximum for "normal" road conditions and minimum speeds don't apply in adverse weather.

To compare: in the 1960's the Pennsylvania Turnpike already had right hand lanes that were built for the exclusive use of SMV's and they were restricted to these lanes. Maybe SMV's should have special permits similar to those presently used for oversize loads.

In a broader area, roads connecting to I-70 are woefully lacking in passing lanes, climb lanes and SMV turnouts. Compare Colo Hwy 14 traversing Cameron Pass: there are so many SMV turnouts that they seem to be every 1/4 mile—the point being that this road is pretty well equipped.

On the other hand, US 6 in Clear Creek Canyon and Colo 9 between I-70 and Kremmling are horrible. CDOT just spent 4? Years rebuilding Colo 9 North of Silverthorne without putting in ONE INCH of SMV turnout or passing lanes, and last year CDOT repaved all of Colo 9 in Grand County with the same problems—no SMV turnouts and no passing or climb lanes without even adding paved shoulders. Compare Wyo 30 running southwest from Laramie: the road was first paved at 18? Feet and nice wide paved shoulders have been added. 18 foot two lane pavements are inadequate—too narrow.

Further, whether or not a tunnel to Colo I19 and Blackhawk is built at Kermit's, the westbound merge from US 6 to I-70 has been atrocious ever since constructed. As is the case of nearly all merge lanes in Colorado, it is much too short and makes it extremely difficult for a slow truck to merge from the left (WRONG) side of the road and safely get to the right lane. Acceleration and deceleration should be built as many are in California. LONG enough that accelerating traffic can reach safe traffic merge speed in a reasonable length of time before being forced to merge and a the corresponding idea applies to deceleration lanes. Traveling at speed limit then entering an exit lane and having to jamb on your brakes to get down to 20 or 30 MPH should be unnecessary.

How much will fuel costs and availability affect travel? Trains are by far the most efficient means of moving masses of people.

How well would monorails or fixed guideways busses be able to cope with steep grades in extremely heavy snow? How well would the new roadway cope with major landslides? Remember what happened when the whole mountain moved between Bakerville and Eisenhower Tunnel?

Thank you for considering these comments,  
Jim Yust

Categorized Comment	235	Zemler, Stan	Associations & Special Interest Groups	1/26/2005	<p>Hi, I'm Stan Zemler. I'm the town manager of Vail. I would like to first acknowledge Jo Ann Sorensen, and I'm going to talk about the I-70 coalition that was formed about six months ago.</p> <p>There are now 29 communities that are a part of the I-70 coalition: Vail, Avon, Minturn, Eagle County, Summit County, Dillon, Frisco, Leadville, Granby, Georgetown, Idaho Springs, to name a few. Jo Ann was instrumental in assisting in the founding of this coalition.</p> <p>We will be coming to everybody -- we won't make you drive so far. We're going to come to all of your communities.</p> <p>First, I'd like to thank CDOT for the extension of the comment period. Last week the 29 cities signed a memorandum agreement with CDOT that led to the extension of the comment period on this rather complicated document.</p> <p>We have a goal -- whether we achieve that goal or not, time will tell, but we have a goal of trying to arrive at a consensus amongst the 29 communities along this stretch east from -- I failed to mention Glenwood and Pitkin counties are also participating -- to Glenwood/Pitkin County area.</p> <p>We will be visiting all 29 communities in the next three months -- three months or so. I will visit all 29 communities, or get in the neighborhood I should say. I don't know that we'll necessarily make it to all 29. We will be asking both the councils, the commissioners, and the community for their input.</p> <p>We will then go into a session, I think, on the 5th and 6th of May and attempt to come out with, if it's possible, a consensus that we will then pass on to CDOT in terms of what we would like to see happen.</p> <p>And now I'll stop talking as part of the coalition. One of the things that I continue to hear in this I-70 conversation is where did this \$4 billion number come from? And I think we will be exploring that over the coming months, because clearly the correct solution here will cost more than \$4 billion. And I continue to hear this question asked, so I'll pose that: Where does that \$4 billion number come from? And people that I hear in these conversations continue to look for some basis of that.</p> <p>And that's all I have to say. So we'll be out to see you.</p>	Transcripts

Categorized Comment	649	Town of Vail	Municipalities	5/24/2005	<p>Town of Vail 75 South Frontage Road Vail, Colorado 81657 970-479-2100 FAX 970-479-2157 www.ci.vail.co.us</p> <p>Ms. Cecelia Joy Project Manager I-70 PEIS Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1 18500 E. Colfax Ave Aurora, CO 80011</p> <p>RE: I-70 Draft PEIS Comments</p> <p>Dear Cecelia</p> <p>The Town of Vail endorses the I-70 Corridor Coalition Preferred Plan. We also appreciate your cooperation and participation with the process. We want added to the record the following comments with regard to the Draft PEIS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The base year ski season used for the PEIS was the lowest in the last 10 years; in particular the skier numbers in Eagle County were significantly lower than previous or prior years due to a marketing scheme known as the Buddy Pass versus the current Colorado Pass. The buddy pass eliminated significant Front Range trips to the Eagle Valley that year due to the fact the Vail and Beaver Creek ski areas were not a part of the program. As the design team has acknowledged this is an 18% difference skier visits once Vail and Beaver Creek were added. Based on using this as the starting point for growth versus the PEIS base year data we want to be assured there is no difference in the final results and outcome.</li> <li>The Town has concerns with utilizing, believed to be (\$.10/mile) transit fare for all transit modes whether a bus in mixed traffic or the ACS system. The PEIS rider surveys indicated the public was more willing to pay a higher fare for the higher speed alternatives.</li> <li>The cost of the West Vail (Simba Run underpass ) interchange is listed at \$3 million. Our estimates for the Simba Run Underpass is \$15-20 million. We request this cost be changed so Simba Run Underpass is not impacted in the future due to low estimates.</li> <li>The town believes it is extremely important prior to constructing any new improvements, areas of the Interstate system currently exceeding environmental standards be mitigated. Our belief is that the proposed highway improvements on I-70 will directly require mitigation of current violations of Federal environmental standards in Vail. Specifically noise, sediment and erosion control, wildlife impacts, degradation of streams and wetlands and the use of 4(f) properties for parking. The highway alternatives as proposed will produce additional traffic and impacts over the do nothing alternative. We also recommend the reintroduction of a program like the Type II Noise mitigation program, in which Vail sites were next in line for funding.</li> <li>The PEIS highway alternatives do not address the impact on local communities of providing parking at the destinations over the transit alternatives. This is a significant impact, both financially and in Vail it may require the use of 4(f) properties.</li> <li>The Town specifically requests from MM 184-169 the alignment of I-70 could be changed if the appropriate environmental clearances were obtained, local approval was obtained, right of way was cleared and there is no increase in maintenance cost to CDOT over the alternatives currently in the draft PEIS. The Town specifically wants to hold open the option of someday either cut and covering the interstate with private use of the air rights or providing for a series of tunnels which allows transfer of Right of Way.</li> <li>The town supports the formation of a transportation organization funded by CDOT. One of the early issues to look at is connecting service between Summit Stage, ECO, and RAFTA and how such a service will be funded.</li> </ol> <p>Once again thank you for your time on this important project.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	Written

Stan Zemler  
Town Manager

Categorized Comment	450	Ziman, Jan	Public	4/25/2005	From: Jan Ziman Sent: Monday, April 25, 2005 12:35 PM To: Wallace, Jean Subject: My concerns on the I-70 Draft Peis project	Email
<p>Dear I-70 Mountain Corridor Project team,</p> <p>I am gravely concerned about your proposals to widen the I-70 corridor. It is going to wipe my town, Idaho Springs and others like it. I find it interesting that you don't notice the morning and evening commutes on I-25 that have 45 minutes backups, five days a week. Skiers will only turn the corridor into more of an autobahn than it already is on weekends. Their suffering of the traffic jams is only 1 day a week, Sunday. Get over it! My husband and I work in Denver five days a week and the commute will be horrible during the 10 years of construction and a toll fee? I have already been in two almost fatal accidents because your CDOT workers failed to put signs appropriately during the construction of the Central City Road.</p> <p>Another critical concern of mine across the board is that I want the decision makers to integrate the needs of wildlife and their habitats in the initial stages of the development plans of any new road designs, thus insuring wildlife preservation concerns will be considered right along with the initial economic concerns.</p> <p>Please remember preserving our natural biodiversity plays a key role in the economic health of our county, thru tourism, hunting, fishing and &amp; wildlife viewing. Your road designs can either enhance habitats or threaten habitats by neglect or default of early inclusion of their needs by altering, fragmenting or restricting the natural migration corridors.</p> <p>An example of what I'm talking about is the new Central City road. The I-70 corridor from hidden valley to Georgetown is critical winter and lambing habitat for the big horn sheep. My questions about the road were: Was there a wildlife impact study done and if there was significant disturbances found, were there changes to the road design to alter the impacts? Were there migration patterns identified in that area? If so, was there an underpass constructed for wildlife movement so the animals wouldn't roam on to the road and cause accidents and deaths? Did fragmentation taken place because of the road design? It also my understanding that under passes where supposed to be constructed along the I-70 corridor but weren't.</p> <p>It is my understanding that the Division of Wildlife did give recommendations but those recommendations were not looked at till after the fact and the road was already under construction. The more we fragment habitats, the more we threaten our wildlife populations.</p> <p>Growth in the next 25 years is imminent but we need to have smart growth that can mutually benefit man and nature. What used to be elk calving grounds are now shoppettes below ski areas. Deer migration routes are now 6 lane highways. Development can either enhance or threaten by neglect or default of early inclusion of their needs by fragmenting, altering or restricting the natural migration corridors. It is easy to overlook or over simplify the needs of wildlife without special training, so I ask you to please get The DOW input in the initial stages of all your road designs and incorporate the recommendations into the initial planning stages of all future long range transportation plans.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Jan Ziman 303-567-4477 2895 Fall River Rd Idaho Springs ,CO, 80452 Clear Creek County resident</p>						