

**AGREN BLANDO COURT REPORTING & VIDEO INC**

---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING

---

IN RE:

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

PUBLIC HEARING PRESENTATION, OCTOBER 2010

---

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

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

I N D E X

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25 I've heard from a couple of folks from

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15 FLO: 486 pages.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25 So the purpose of tonight's meeting

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

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

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

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

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

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

25           We didn't want to have a solution that

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 Corridor.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 resource development, all join together.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 And I'll highlight these next.

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

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

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

1 a monumental accomplishment for this study.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

17 THE REPORTER: Please spell your name.

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

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

1 those questions tonight. Thank you.

2 Thank you, Amy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 thank you.

2 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you, Patrick.

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

5 MR. HOCEVAR: Hocevar.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 our other court reporter in the gymnasium area.

2 Thank you. Our next speaker is Roger Westman.

3 Please state your name, spell it, and provide an  
4 address.

5 MR. WESTMAN: My name is Roger Westman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 to Summit County.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12 THE REPORTER: I know, but --

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Transit.

25 MR. KATT: I support transit, too.

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

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

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

1 MS. STROMBITSKI: Ken --

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

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

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

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

25 I would like to applaud CDOT, too,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

20 MS. STROMBITSKI: Please spell  
21 Anderson.

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

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

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

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

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

22  
23  
24  
25

1 STATE OF COLORADO)

2 )ss. REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

3 COUNTY OF DENVER )

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

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

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

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

19 My commission expires May 10, 2011.

20

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

23

24

25