

Gentlemen - I find it hard to understand how you can advocate for the 'cover' at Swansea Elementary over the proposed I-70East Project in view of the debacle we all experienced when a similar 'cover' existed to accommodate the runway over I-70 at the now defunct Stapleton International Airport!! Ya'll gotta be nuts.

I am in favor of the plan to move the viaduct to a sub-grade corridor. My concern is the partial covering currently planned. If we get a snow event to match the rain event of 2013, there will be no way for CDOT plows to push enough snow aside to keep I-70 open in the sub-grade section. There will be no place to push the snow to. The solution is to cover the entire section, and keep the snow and ice, and water out, to begin with. This will provide more surface area for the at-grade neighborhood, and offer more protection from the elements for the sub-grade sections. Added one-time initial costs will be more than offset by reduced long-term continuing costs and avoid closures for major rain and snow events. Thank you.

Please reconsider rerouting I-70 along the corridor occupied by interstates 270 and 76 to the north. This is a better and cheaper plan than widening and lowering the existing route of I-70.

The comment section of the website is not working right now so I am forwarding my email comments as follows: The majority of my comments have to do with a article that I found recently from Wired Magazine (see link attached) "What's Up With That: Building Bigger Roads Actually Makes Traffic Worse" [http://www.wired.com/2014/06/wuwt-traffic-induced-demand/?mbid=social\\_fb](http://www.wired.com/2014/06/wuwt-traffic-induced-demand/?mbid=social_fb) Results from the study in the article: "We found that there's this perfect one-to-one relationship," said Turner. If a city had increased its road capacity by 10 percent between 1980 and 1990, then the amount of driving in that city went up by 10 percent. If the amount of roads in the same city then went up by 11 percent between 1990 and 2000, the total number of miles driven also went up by 11 percent. It's like the two figures were moving in perfect lockstep, changing at the same exact rate." Turner and Duranton argue, is what they call the fundamental law of road congestion: New roads will create new drivers, resulting in the intensity of traffic staying the same. If the findings and study are actually true that means that Denver is going in the wrong direction for the long-term vision of the city, state and country which should be to reduce traffic size and find more alternative, environmentally friendly ways of transportation for its citizens. Denver is leading the way in many other areas, why not lead the way on this one. 10 lanes is not the answer, let's not let this place turn into Los Angeles!! I am opposed to the currently proposed I 70 expansion project and would be in favor of rerouting out of the city and turning the current I 70 route into a boulevard. It may be more expensive but it is a better long-term vision for our city. Thank you for listening

1. Why aren't the added lanes continued out PAST 270 all the way to 225 (or even Pena BLVD?) All the traffic from 270 flows onto I-70, and the congestion isn't relieved until you reach 225 (or Pena Blvd.)  
2. So, while all this I-70 construction is going on, where is all that traffic supposed to go? Don't tell me 270. That thing is LOCKED UP EVERY DAY. If you're going to put the traffic onto 270, you need to expand it by one lane in each direction AND FIX THE VASQUEZ EXIT. It is hard to get on and off of that exit, and the exit from EB onto exit is way too tight - so you have to slow down, which slows down all the traffic in back.  
Thanks.

Proven evidence shows that by removing federal interstate highways from our cities is one of the best environmental, economic and equitable moves a state DOT can make. Unprecedented growth and economic development occurred along the San Francisco Bay when the Embarcadero Freeway was removed after it collapsed. Milwaukee is another example where the removal of an inner-city highway has set the stage for economic growth. Seattle is yet another city that has chosen to remove a highway from it's inner city. With all this evidence, why is it that Denver and CDOT are choosing the opposite? Keeping I-70 in place and, worse yet, widening it and adding toll lanes when we have a transit artery slated to open in 2016 is the wrong move for our region to be making at a time when auto-dependence is on the decline. If anything, these funds should be allocated for MORE rail transit that would absorb the anticipated congestion. My vote is to MOVE I-70 to align with I-270 and to open this land up to increased development

Before you subject Denver to even more highway devastation, please conduct a draft supplemental EIS of the I-270/I-76 reroute option. The below grade option is unacceptable for so many reasons: -time and disruption for completion, -continued and increased pollution, congestion, and noise, -a boulevard and reroute would do so much more to unite the affected neighborhoods and beautify our city, -below grade freeways are more difficult to expand, have worse backups if there is a crash, are prone to flooding. For the sake of the future of the city and all neighborhoods affected, please study the reroute option. Thank you.

I-70 is in very poor repair especially from Vail to Denver The road has frequent broken sections which challenge driver to maintain lane control and prevent damage to vehicle There are many sections of severe truck travel grooves which redirect vehicle steering and potential for loss of control Why can't this highly utilized road be maintained?  
Beautification of the highway, re-routing and improved appearances should be secondary to maintenance for safety Sincerely Peter Hamilton

CDOT's proposed I-70 east plan appears to focus on wasting the maximum amount of tax dollars now, forcing the waste of twice as much in the future and inflicting maximum damage on the people who now live proximate. Stop it. It's a cruel hoax on a neighborhood that needs to hear the truth. If maximizing waste and cruelty is this plan's purpose, it is excellent. It will maximize current and future waste of money. That money is desperately needed elsewhere. Stop the waste. Tell the truth. I-70 is one of America's primary east west extremely heavy interstate heavy motor vehicle corridors. It is a massively heavy transit corridor, not a highway. The impact of all such transportation corridors is 20 blocks wide at minimum. The noise, air, health and quality of life impact of all such corridors is overwhelming to adjacent areas. Pretending that such a fuel, noise, vapor and toxic pollution belching machine can pass through a residential community is a cruel joke. Everyone understands that all local residents and communities like their community, neighbors and do not want change. It's a cruel fool who says you can have a community in a heavy transportation corridor. Everyone knows the negative medical impact is 20 blocks wide. That 20 block wide I-70 impact corridor is either where it is or you have to move that impact corridor to other people's back yard. You can't try to let people live next to I-70 without swimming uphill. The school next to I-70 MUST be vacated. Allowing a school next to an interstate corridor is child abuse without extraordinary mitigation. This plan is pure wasteful swimming uphill and pretending reality does not exist. Trying to force the public to pay for swimming upstream for the next 50 years is almost criminally negligent. This is a national heavy traffic transportation corridor. Being a fume, air toxin and pollution belching machine is its highest and best use. Its traffic will double and redouble. It will destroy air and life quality everywhere around it emitting an uncontrollable plume of exhaust and air borne tire bits corrupting the air and life around it. Any plan that tries to keep people near that corridor and breathing that air is extreme cruelty. The quality of life anywhere near it will not be poor and will get worse. Deal with it. Be humane. Condemn or buy out enough rights for future purchase to minimize the taxpayers long term costs. Do it now while capital can be obtained at low cost which will allow local residents can be paid more now than in the future in compensation. The window is brief. The reason that businesses with large paved area needs and minimum employees locate next to national transportation corridors is that it is unhealthy for even adults to be near one, even for 8 hours a day. Encouraging people to live in that air muck just transfers CDOT transportation costs to much larger medical costs.

The current CDOT proposal maximizes cost and human suffering with a laughable roof that will just have to be removed when CDOT again pretends be surprised that it needs to be widened again in 20 years. Get real. A major US transportation heavy truck traffic lane needs to be a minimum 2 to 4 blocks wide corridor to function. It has to be wide enough to allow replacement bridges and lanes to be built as the existing ones remain full of traffic. That takes a wide path. Just do it. Issuing bonds today to buy or condemn properties to pay out funds for purchase or options to owners must be done now. Options that give CDOT the land in 10-25 years does not cost much now. Homes can be used for the 10-30 years or until the land is needed for its highest and best use, I-70 national transit corridor. All the major national transit corridors are borders of communities that border commercial property, not part of one. Tell people the truth. Accept reality. Make a plan to deal with it. The CDOT plan is a denial of reality that inflicts the most damage to people and taxpayers. CDOT's plan is a cruel hoax on the people of that neighborhood and taxpayers. It's the worst of all possible solutions.

Please conduct a draft supplemental EIS for the I-270 and I-76 option. Thanks

I am a long-time resident of the Regis neighborhood and continue to be dismayed that a freeway cuts through historic parks & neighborhoods. Every morning the roar of traffic, of trucks shifting down gears & engines revving, is maddening. The constant dust of rubber & carcinogens frightening. I have been to neighborhood meetings when the real old-timers speak up about the disservice and broken promises of CDOT, how Federal Blvd north of the highway was never beautified as promised, how the fence is rickety and the landscaping neglected. Can anyone imagine a freeway getting a vote of approval if it were to cut through Washington Park, plowing through community, tearing down homes & scarring parks and wetlands? No: North Denver has always been marginalized. The neighborhoods of Globeville, Elyria, & Swansea further brutalized by a dilapidated viaduct. It's time to be progressive. A healthy neighborhood is NOT comprised of a major freeway, even if it's below grade. The proposed burial of the highway

1. You would be better off spending the money on public transit increasing light rail and buses 2. Do you remember what it was like when the Stapleton airport had overpasses that darkened the highway there were slowdowns 3. If you need to widen it you should do so using I-270 instead of I-70, there would be no need to go underground

5 free lanes in each direction. If you want to add a toll lane, add a 6th. Two toll lanes + the 5 lanes in each direction would be even better. I've seen these types of projects in major cities like Phoenix, LA, Houston, and Dallas. It's time Denver step it up and start building for the future. A design like this supported by the new light rail would make a BIG difference in terms of congestion. But it would never get approved (funded) because the voters don't want Denver to "become the next LA." So I guess we'll settle for less. And people will enjoy some sitting in some more traffic. Case in point: How many drivers today wish I-25 had that 5th lane from 225-to downtown Denver like the original TREX plan called for?

I actually see more merit in not building the cap and even in not widening I-70 for that expanse, and expense. I don't like a through lane that favors those who can afford it. I don't like the further division of Swansea and Elyria, nor the option that takes more houses. I see going below the EPA cap and into the water table as folly. I am not sure the costs have been updated and hate to see a contractor have an opportunity to raise the costs due to "unforeseen situations".

I am writing to comment on the planned expansion of I 70 east of I 25.

I have many concerns about the current plan and wanted to write to voice those concerns as well as comment on some of the benefits of finding an alternative. Looking at the plans as they are now, the solution seems to be creating as many problems as it solves. The highway ends up wider, but it seems, in the same vein as the T-Rex project (a segment I drive every day) to move the problem to a new location, rather than create a solution. That is to say, the South Vally Highway was rebuilt to ease traffic, but simply moved the traffic jam a bit up the road, causing the need for more construction at the 25/Santa Fe interchange. Now that project is largely done, and it has moved the traffic problem another 1/4 mile.

It is my belief that we should, as a society, and as responsible tax payers, use our fund wisely. The massive disruption of schools, neighborhoods, Purina (a significant contributor to the cities economy), the National Wester Complex (another important financial contributor to the city) as well as the many small businesses which will be effected are all costs that should be counted.

About 10 years ago I worked as a lumber delivery person and drove over many highways, all around Denver. Even then it was frequently faster for me to go around the city, on 76 and 270 then to go through the middle. This makes sense. We should strive to direct large delivery, through traffic, and non city traffic out of the city, rather than right through it. There are noise, safety and health reasons for this. Many cities across the country acres with this concept and it is not infrequent that one will drive "through" a city only to find that they did not see the city at all. Why we would not consider something like this as well is strange to me. The infrastructure is there for us to make a bypass plan, but the current idea does nothing to take advantage of it, and instead builds on an antiquated notion of traffic patterns. I am not sure why this option is not, at the very least the alternative option (rather than building a mini version of this by pass from scratch) much less the main option. I am also somewhat shocked to learn that after the disaster of the public/private partnership concerning HWY 36 to boulder, that this is an option still on the table. I have serious concerns about the effectiveness of such options, as they seem to do nothing, or nearly nothing, to reduce traffic, but do still line offshore companies pockets. Why is Denver ever considering this option? There is not sufficient explanation. I would kindly request that my tax dollars be used to benefit the city in a more prudent manner, and that we not disrupt the thriving North Denver corridor, but in stead make it more valuable by transferring heavy traffic to I-76 and 270, possibly even converting it to be the path of I-70, and reduce the current highway corridor into a city street or boulevard. This would bring North Denver closer together and provide a much more valuable environment for the city. In stead of streets, it is possible we could have trees and parks. Obviously there would still be a need for traffic to the previously mentioned businesses, and the infrastructure for this traffic is already present. A useful alternative can be found, and I strongly request that such an alternative be found.

To be honest, if projects like this are forced through, I am sure that many people, like myself and my neighbors, will be forced to look out for the health and wellbeing of our family, by finding a community which will take our concerns into consideration.

Regards,

As a native Denver metro resident, I watched as I-70 became part our highway system. I remember taking a car ride with my parents and brothers and sisters when I-70 first opened. It was a thrill then, but now it is a pain to drive especially between Wadsworth and Colorado Blvd. My husband and I wholeheartedly believe the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative is a perfect option and no other should be considered. We think it would be nice if more of the highways were partially covered. How about trying Arapahoe Rd and I-25. We especially think it is wrong to move the highway north or south of I-70's current location. That would be a joke!!

I live off of 50th and Pecos and my son attends Beach Court Elementary, 1/4 mile away from I-70. My family supports the proposal to look into re-routing I-70. My primary concern with any plan to repair/fix/widen I-70 as it currently exists is that literally thousands of children and families will be exposed to unnecessary noise and air pollution. There are several schools within half a mile of I-70 between in this area so that is not at all an exaggeration. We have a duty to protect our children, if they attempt to repair and widen I-70 they will be playing outside every day breathing in construction debris and there is no possible way to protect them from this but we can avoid it. The nice "parkway" style design in North Denver that they propose in this North Denver neighborhood is a great idea. That area was not the most beautiful and now looks 100% better with that "parkway" style design. I think that this Chaffee park neighborhood deserves this "parkway" at street level as opposed to the highway as it sits now. The displacements that widening I-70 would cause can be avoided by re-routing I-70 and our neighborhood will be all the more beautiful without the blight of the highway running through it. I see many pros to re-routing highway, and many cons to repair/fix/widen I-70 - please take my thoughts into consideration. Thank you

There is a need to study removing the highway from the neighborhood and rerouting traffic- this is huge! Why has that option not been further explored? This project will result in increased air pollution and health risks to children, as well as increased noise pollution. The impacted neighborhoods do not need further damage from widening the highway

I favor the new plan and think it will improve the quality of life for Denver. The worries of hauling dirt will not be a serious health threat because there are techniques to do so while keeping dust to a minimum. Pollution will be reduced because more lanes will allow cars to pass through and travel at speeds that allow tail pipe emissions to be very low because that is the most effecient operating level for the engine. Not doing so will allow a daily traffic jam and cars will sit and pollute even more. Noise will be mitigated and sent under ground. It will allow the city to not have borders divided by the highway. Local traffic is part of this but it is a federal highway and it allows more than just the city to benefit. I like the park idea.

My largest concern about the project is the impact on nearby neighborhoods. I am seriously concerned about plans to "improve" the Vasquez and Steele exit to increase the amount of traffic funneled into a residential area that does not have the infrastructure or interest in increased traffic. Keep the traffic on Colorado and get rid of the Vasquez/Steele interchange so that land can be used for neighborhood amenities. how\_often\_travel\_corridor: Everyday primary\_reason\_to\_travel\_corridor: Commute how\_transportation\_can\_be\_improved\_in\_corridor: As a person who primarily travels by bicycle, the best thing that can happen in the study corridor is the creation of safe, well lit, and at grade ways to cross I-70. People should not have to take their lives in their own hands (and loose their lives as has happened at I-70 and York) to access Denver neighborhoods. how\_receiving\_info: Public Meetings,Newsletter comments\_questions: Has CDOT taken into consideration the impact of light rail expansion on usage of I-70? We don't need a wider highway- we need safe transit, bicycle and walking routes in our city.

I am writing to request that CDOT not continue with their plans to widen I-70. Widening the highway will continue to place the citizens of Globeville, Swansea and Elyria in a toxic environment that not only threatens the health of the entire community, but especially their children attending Swansea Elementary. You cannot seriously assert that simply placing a "cover" over the highway will fix the problem and then brazenly place the children's playground on top of the cover. I can guarantee none of the CDOT panel nor the city council members backing this plan would ever let their children or grandchildren attend a school in this location, yet they have determined it's all right for the underserved and pushed aside population of northeast Denver. In addition, there are a number of other concerns regarding this project that raise a red flag -- Public Private Partnership, toll lanes. a trench that will be flooded in heavy rains, a tunnel that will receive little sunlight and be iced over causing accidents

I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.

Hello,

I've been going through the I-70 East SDEIS and am hoping you can help me track down a couple pieces of information.

First, is there a section of the SDEIS that discussed the decision to add two new managed lanes (in the preliminary Preferred Alt) rather than just one managed lane or one general purpose lane?

Also, while not easy to do under current federal law, I was wondering if there was a discussion of the possibility of converting existing capacity to managed lanes.

I'd appreciate if you can point me in the right direction!

Thanks,

As a resident and business owner in the surrounding RINO neighborhood and citizen of Denver, we have concern that adding significantly capacity to highway will create an overwhelmingly negative impact on the neighborhood. I70 in its present form is widely blamed for destroying traditional working class and predominantly minority neighborhoods--Gloveville, Elyria and Swansea. Despite all the economic development throughout the metro area, these neighborhoods remain so of the most distressed in the city. I70 expansion in this area will reinforce and exaggerate that pattern for decades to come. Furthermore, Highway expansion in the urban core of a city that is getting a high level of growth is inconsistent with best practices throughout the country. Another result of added capacity is to impair economic development in the city by encouraging further car usage without a proportional investment in other modes of transportation.

Please do not allow the neighborhoods to be disturbed yet again. I know the people who live in these neighborhoods have been traditionally disenfranchised, but it is time to take a new look at this practice and change it. I know landlords got reimbursement from the Superfund site in this area, but no compensation went to people who actually lived there and rented. I hate to see these citizens again have their lives disrupted.

Why was the full re-route that is on both I-270 & I-76 not studied as a part of this SEIS? CDOT already owns the right-of-way needed to widen I-76 and I-270, without taking any homes or businesses and, along the I-76 and I-270 routes there are ZERO (0) neighborhoods that are immediately-adjacent to the freeways, compared to 11 along I-70 between Stapletons Central Park Blvd and Harlan [the re-route area] that are directly impacted. The current plan would be a tremendous injustice to the residents of Globeville, Elyria & Swansea specifically - I am certain that a plan like this would not be floated going through any more affluent communities. Additionally the costs of building and maintaining this project are ridiculous and unnecessary. Get with the times! Modern city planning gets the stinky highways OUT of the city! People want to live in the city and enjoy it, not deal with noise and pollution. CDOT, PLEASE do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both! I-270 and I-76.

One word - SNOW! With the lowered alternative, where do you plow the snow to? You're building a trench that will catch any blowing and drifting snow. DOH! My next comment is cost. This is a transportation path. Spend the money to repair and improve it. We don't need to turn this into a multi BILLION park.

The re-evaluation of the 2008 draft EIS appears to have been conducted with the PACT. I have the report "I-70 East Environmental Impact Statement Preferred Alternative Collaborative Team (PACT) Summary Report (October 2011), but it falls short of describing the process and criteria used by CDOT and FHWA in determining if a new draft EIS was needed versus pursuing a supplemental draft EIS. In the Supplemental Draft EIS (August 2014), Section 1.8, you state "CDOT and FHWA re-examined the previously eliminated alternatives. This resulted in the development of a new alternative called the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative." According to 23 CFR 771.129 Re-evaluations, "a written evaluation of the draft EIS shall be prepared by the applicant in cooperation with the Administration if an acceptable final EIS is not submitted to the Administration within three years from the date of the draft EIS circulation. The purpose of this evaluation is to determine whether or not a supplement to the draft EIS or a new draft EIS is needed." Can you please provide correspondence, process, and criteria, that CDOT used (post-PACT) to decide whether a supplement to the draft was more appropriate than a new draft. Thank you ,

I am strongly advocating that CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. The people of Colorado are watching: will our political leaders show the wisdom and courage to follow in the lead of great cities like San Francisco that dismantled overhead freeways? The current plan to widen the freeway in a ditch, combined with toll lanes, is a very bad solution for our city. Here are just few reasons why: 1. We have a once in a 100 year opportunity to change the freeway at heart of our city from an ugly embarrassment into a zone of revitalization and growth. The "cap" covers very little of the ditch and does nothing to hid the open scar that cuts through our city. 2. Denver can partner with neighboring counties to find a solution that creates greater economic opportunity for all. If i70 was re-routed, surrounding counties would benefit from transportation and other businesses that would locate next to the re-routed freeway. Businesses would benefit from lower operating costs outside of Denver. 3. If i70 was re-routed, the land around the "old" i70 could be revitalized into an urban greenbelt that provided much-needed housing to Denver. A mix of housing and business would bring additional economic growth for Denver. 4. Toll lanes punish the poor in favor of the wealthy and should never be implemented in urban areas. 5. It is unconscionable to actually move the i70 closer to our schools. The combination of releasing polluted dirt airborne during construction, and the ongoing pollution from the freeway every day, will not improve the health of our children.

<p>I would like the committee to study the possibility of rerouting I-70 onto what is now I-270 and transform 46th Ave in NE Denver and 48th Ave in NW Denver to a boulevard similar to Martin Luther King Blvd. widening I 70 and putting lanes underground would only impact a small area of Denver and remove many low income homes that now exist in these areas. Because the current plan locks us in for 75 years or so it is essential that all options are investigated before a final decision is made.</p>
<p>Reroute I-70!!!! this is best way for all neighborhoods and all the people concerned in area!!!</p>
<p>I am concerned all the digging will cause agents into the atmosphere and hurt the air quality in my neighborhood</p>
<p>Highways are a tremendous waste of real estate within city limits. Not only are they aesthetically displeasing, but they are notoriously dangerous parts of town and noisy for those who do live close by. Additionally, much of the real estate close to highways is unable to be developed, whether it be for zoning restrictions, or because few people in their right minds would ever want to develop real estate next to a highway. This is why rerouting I70 northward to 270 to I76 makes so much sense. It allows the city of Denver and the residents of Elyria/Swansea, Globeville, etc. to reclaim that part of the city. It would also create a tremendous opportunity develop the property around this area, making it more economically viable, aesthetically please for the city and residents of Denver, and accessible to all residents. I implore you to please make a decision about this that will benefit the residents of the city in the long run (like 100 years in the long run); not simply what's most convenient for moving traffic from point A to point B. Too often city planning decisions are made based on what's convenient for cars and traffic without considering what's best for people, land and space. The city of Denver greatly benefits by rerouting I70, and I hope you will make this decision for the greater good of the city. Thank you</p>
<p>Hello. I am completely surprised that CDOT is pushing to triple the width of the freeway through the middle of Denver while spending over a billion dollars to bury it in the hopes that the people living next to the road will give their blessing. We should do a full study on the re-route around Denver following the I-270/I-76 route, given that it impacts less neighborhoods and schools, given that the right-of-way is already available (if the wide shoulders between the roads and the fence are to be believed) and given that the goal shouldn't be to merely move more cars, but to do it in a way that serves a greater purpose. Consolidating highways and allowing the neighborhoods of north Denver to heal would provide more economic and social value than burying the highway at greater cost. It also makes no sense to widen a freeway immediately adjacent to a soon-to-be-completed rail line that will draw off many commuters that today use the highway.</p>
<p>The current I-70 plan is irresponsible and unjust to communities that can least afford it. Please consider the rerouting plan that would help us preserve neighborhoods, keep children safe and make Denver even more livable.</p>
<p>This is one issue that will impact everyone in our community. A real fantastic opportunity exists to increase property values and livability with a Blvd. that will improve and connect the communities east of the highlands close to I 70 vs. continue to isolate them and fill them with pollution which impacts us here in the highlands as well. Please take a few moments for the benefit of yourself, our children, and our community quality of life to make a difference. One the CDOT plan is underway we will be stuck with the impact for decades which is why this is so so important!</p>
<p>I heard that one of the proposed plans for I70 expansion included taking down the Purina factory if you widened the highway to the South. I know that Purina employs people, and shutting it down might effect those people, so that plan had some pushback. But I can say I speak for most residents of Denver when I say that the smell of that factory is nauseating and we would all be happy to see it go. It negatively effects property values in the immediate area and its an eyesore. If its at all a possibility, Im all for expanding south and taking it out. I would love to be able to enjoy the outdoors without it smelling like Im sitting in a bowl of dog food. Thanks!!</p>
<p>Hi I live in NW Denver and here are my comments regarding the study;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I-70 is going to be a 40 foot deep canal with a 1/2% drainage grade to a pumping station to the south. Really? The water table level is at 22 feet now. Maybe 19 feet if they would have checked at a different time of year.</li> <li>2. At 40 ' below grade, most of this stretch will be in the shade during winter months. Where is the snow and ice going? No where with a plow. SO we are going to send the continuous stream of Mag Chloride into the Platte? I know it's harmless except for when it touches metal and plants. This will be a maintenance nightmare.</li> <li>3. Nearly 40% of Swansea's elementary school kids will need to cross from the south side and a large portion of the school's grounds will be eaten up. There are not enough safe crossings.</li> <li>4. Do we really have another 50 year contract for 8 toll lanes? What is the other option? I would pay more in sales taxes if I was guaranteed the tax payers cost is capped at a certain dollar amount and time period.</li> <li>5. This excavation will require at minimum 70,000 truck loads of dirt be removed in the form of partially contaminated soil from the smelters. Where is it going? Yes, some reclamation took place in the 90's, but only in some areas of the residential areas. CDOT is "taking" a large section of industrial area? Why?</li> <li>6. The on ramp for trucks west bound from Vasquez will need to snake along and pile up along a service road for at least a mile on the north side of I-70 heading west. Not a good plan.</li> <li>7. They already know they will hit water at 22 feet below grade and they want to go 40? There is a below grade water plume that will be halted and it may back up into peoples basements.</li> <li>8. Independent engineering groups have already figured the cost per lane mile is far cheaper to re-route much of this traffic north on I-270 and I-76 where we already own 300' of right of way. It is only an extra 1.8 miles and it goes through a Sunco refinery and some gravel pits. We have already seen countless areas where CDOT dramatically widens one section only to create a 20 minute bottle neck just down the road. If they widen this section this far it will only put pressure on NW Denver's section of I-70.</li> <li>9. The RFP if I am not mistaken is only 15% engineered and allows for huge gaps for contingencies allowing the price to triple like many of RTD's projects.</li> <li>10. The housing values in Swansea and Globeville have flat lined over the last 15 years. It is nice CDOT is willing to give the residents an extra \$40,000 when they take their house, but for \$120,000-\$150,000, where are they suppose to buy a house?</li> <li>11. CDOT is not an urban planner and their last couple "Re-Do's" like I-25 near the old Gates Rubber plant just made it worse. Not to mention a huge list of other projects.</li> </ol> <p>This project is destined to be on the national news for 10 years as the next big hole. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE get these people on the right track. Please ask for clarification regarding these and other issues.</p>

Requesting that CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. As a north Denver resident I am most interested in the following: 1.The environmental impact to the surrounding community in digging up the 8,200' trench. The removal of contaminated dirt and what will be done with this dirt is concerning. 2. The cost analysis of the re-route/46th Ave alternative versus the proposed tunnel plan. CDOT and those opposed to the tunnel, seem to have very different answers to this. It would be helpful to see details on true estimates. 3.The concerns around tunnel traffic, weather conditions, and maintenance costs versus the re-routed freeway. The tunnel does appear to be a more dangerous alternative. I don't want to delay a solution that is badly needed for the city of Denver. However, there have been really valid arguments brought up that appears CDOT has not provided a full consideration to. It's hard to brush it off without looking a little further. Especially because it directly affects the community I live in.

I firmly believe the lower partial cover is the best alternative here. The park and the sidewalks will really help us change the atmosphere in our neighborhood and it will be much SAFER in my opinion. It would also be nice to have our property values increase as another benefit of doing this. Higher values will mean that people will take better care of their homes and we certainly need more of that around Swansea and Globeville! Thank you, George I always try and attend the monthly meetings. I have been to about 4 of them

When first hearing the idea of rerouting I70 I thought it a brilliant idea. I still do. It is as if the City of Denver and the State of Colorado talk out of both sides of their mouth on transit. Sell your car and take the public transportation efforts such as short term car use (car2go), bike sharing (b-cycle), added RTD routes such as on Colfax (rather than a trolley)are contrary to needing more lanes on I70. If there is extra money laying around lets use it on our citizens, not some dinosaur idea like expanded highways for cars.

I would like to voice opposition to the proposal to run the I70 expansion below grade through the existing I70 corridor. When this portion of I70 was constructed in the 60s, it forever divided many thriving north and west Denver communities. We now have an opportunity to correct this decades old injustice. The I76 corridor already runs through an industrial area as opposed to a neighborhood. It therefore only makes sense that this be pursued as a first option, instead of being dismissed on incomplete analysis. Rerouting I70 further north would also restore one of the great sweeping vistas that used to exist from Berkeley Park north through the Willis Case golf course. The below grade option has a host of environmental difficulties, included increasing the noise and air pollution in the Swansea and adjacent neighborhoods. Please reconsider your I70 expansion options.

My comment is that I-70 through the Swansea neighborhood should not be elevated (as it is currently) submerged (the proposed state) nor re-routed as others are advocating, rather I would like to see I-70 re-established at grade, with a handful of /overpasses just as freeways are anywhere else. To me this is a much saner (and less expensive) approach. Of course, the overpasses would be made pedestrian/bicycle/handicap friendly.

As a resident, father of 3, small business owner and employer in NW Denver, I fully endorse and support the feasibility study for rerouting I-70 through North Denver. I work in real estate locally and know how great this city can be with 70 moved northward TOWARD the planned Gold Line Light Rail Stops on 76! From a mass transit perspective this makes great sense! AND the impacts to 76 and 225 would be MINIMAL! We have an obligation to the future of this great city to explore all options and make the best decision! Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance.

From Blueprint Denver: "Regardless of the availability of funds, expanding streets and highways would have to overcome immense environmental obstacles and neighborhood opposition. Given these constraints, it makes sense to look to alternative solutions to transportation problems solutions that focus on maximizing the investment in existing infrastructure, integrating land-use and transportation planning, and promoting other modes of transportation." I recently moved to the area across from Willis Case golf course. I commented to a distant relative at a family reunion that it seemed so tragic that the city decided to break up one of Denver's most beautiful parks with views of the front range and the historic Lakeside tower. What an incredible place this must have been without all the noise and pollution that the decision to split the city golf course park and lake in half and divide a unified neighborhood by a loud polluting highway. She told me that her family lost their home to the decision and that the community's voice had been ignored when they decided to put the highway straight through a neighborhood and a beautiful park. Hindsight is 20/20. It seems we are at a similar place now. Why not learn from history? If we are going to spend millions, let's move our loud, busy, polluting highway out of the neighborhoods! Why was the full re-route that is on both I-270 & I-76 not studied as a part of this SEIS? Let's look at Blueprint Denver's goals more closely: Preserving and enhancing the individuality, diversity and livability of Denver's neighborhoods & Supporting the development of a clean, efficient and innovative transportation system Please don't spend my tax dollars to repeat or expand upon a historic mistake. We are such a forward thinking city that others look to for environmental and transportation solutions. Let's do the right thing!

I am writing to express great concern with the apparent "push" that is being made to expand I-70 in its current location that has proven clearly that it will never be a large enough corridor to effectively connect east and west Denver. In particular I have concerns that the widening East of I-25 will only inevitably lead to widening west of I-25 which is not viable without considerable destruction of existing neighborhoods. The proposed impact seems quite unfeasible since we all know that we have low water tables in Denver and a road project would become an ongoing issue of water as well. Creating the "ditch" that would be I-70 not only seems overly expensive, but likely will create huge impact on water for decades to come. It would seem that with all of the congestion, moving it underground won't solve the problem. I don't see how this inherently connects the neighborhoods to the north when there is a relatively small section that would be "opened up" Since the road flies over technically those corridors are open, but there is still a disconnect. However you put it, there is still a freeway cutting through the heart of what once used to be connected areas of the city. Moreover, there is an existing corridor that already does not have much habitation and is quite industrial (compared to the current I-70 corridor) and would provide a much better alternative for expansion. That of course if the I-76 and I-270 corridor. The additional mileage is negated by the fact that traffic could actually be on the move. Plus future expansion of a more direct (alternative path) to the airport could free up some of the pressure on the further East Section of I-70/225 by eliminating much of the extra traffic that by-and-large is trying to avoid the E-470 tolls. For these and other obvious reasons, I am ardently against expanding I-70 as currently planned and especially against the idea of burying the freeway which I believe will not accomplish the intended connection of the northern neighborhoods to the main city. I want to assure that CDOT does an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76 which seems like a better long-term and more economically viable alternative.

I am extremely opposed to CDOT plan of widening I-70. I believe this freeway should be re-routed along I-76 and I 270. My reasons stem from the health consequences that have already occurred and will intensify in the communities of Globeville, Swansea, and Elyria. I live in Berkeley, a division impacted adversely by I-70, and I attend church in Globeville. I would like to feel good about buying property in Globeville to be closer to Transfiguration Cathedral. These small communities deserve a chance to breathe normal air. Their health statistics are horrible. Increased incidence of asthma leading to obesity. Destruction of historic homes. Worse property values. The chance to have a real boulevard leading to increased commerce, property values, and community. There are so many reasons NOT to widen I-70, and so many reasons TO discuss alternatives, I do not understand the need for protests. The west moving to the east can still use I-76. Denver is trying to be a contemporary city, we need to follow the examples of other cities who have dismantled urban freeways and installed boulevards.

To whom it may concern, As a public health nurse and resident of the Clayton neighborhood, I cannot adequately express my concern for the current preliminarily identified Preferred Alternative. The poor health outcomes on the surrounding neighborhoods are well documented, with higher rates of cancer of all kinds since I-70 was built. To even consider building a larger highway next to an elementary school is not only unethical but undermines the intention to strengthen these neighborhoods. You can build buildings to hold as many shops as you want, but any improvement in this area will not be sustainable without environmental safety as well. I urge you to study the cost and environmental impact of a reroute (widened and improved I-270 and I-76) and restore I-70 to a thoroughfare. If the projection of growth in Denver is correct, than a reroute for through-traffic also makes the most logical sense for residents of the area. Best regards

I am in favor of part of the Partial Covered Lowered Alternative. I believe that lowering the roadway and covering it in the locations identified will greatly benefit the adjacent neighborhoods while maintaining access for other destinations near the corridor. However, I am strongly opposed to the 12 mile proposed widening of the highway to the east. In an era of increasing transit and a leveling off of vehicular usage, I believe this to be a colossal waste of money and resources. These resources should instead be dedicated to funding alternative modes of transportation in the corridor in order to meet transportation demands, reduce use of fossil fuels, and reduce air pollution. To me, widening an urban highway in the 21st century is akin to building a giant horse barn at the beginning of the 20th century to meet the forecast increase in horse traffic.

I am writing to voice my concern with the current I-70 East proposals. I believe the following issues are substantial and have not been adequately addressed by any of the proposed plans: 1. Social Justice - I am concerned that widening I-70 through Globeville and the Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods will further reduce the quality of life for the residents in this area. The quantity of homes, businesses and land that will be taken, combined with increased air pollution and continued lack of connectivity to surrounding areas is a high price to pay, and for the residents of this area will be disproportionate to the benefit they will see from the highway expansion. The idea that these neighborhoods will give up more houses, businesses, historic districts and parks in part to provide toll lanes so wealthier motorists can bypass traffic is unacceptable. 2. Financing - the cost of the project is substantial and I have concerns about money being diverted from statewide projects to fund the I-70 expansion. 3. Future Expansion - In my neighborhood I-70 is sandwiched between Berkely Lake and Willis Case Golf Course, two City of Denver Parks. I do not see how future expansion of the highway (to match the proposed expansion to the east) in this part of town can be accommodated without taking public parkland, which would be highly unacceptable to residents in this area. 4. I do not believe the widening of the interstate highway system supports the long term vision for our city. I believe an alternative approach should be studied, including re-routing through traffic on I-70 onto I-76 and I-270. This alternative would include the Boulevard approach along 46th avenue and the strengthening of the city grid in these areas to support increased travel. I also believe study should be give to alternate modes of transportation, including bus, train, bike and pedestrian to reduce local demand on the interstate highway system.

Please consider routing this on I-76, where there would be much less impacts to residential neighborhoods; air quality, noise, and transforming a residential area into a highway.

Hi. I live within two blocks of I-70 on a section that is not slated for expansion at this time. I believe you are getting a lot of comments urging reevaluation of a proposal to reroute I-70 through 270 and I-76. A lot of the people who want you to consider that proposition seem to believe that CDOT will simply abandon the old I-70 route and make it into a park or a beltway or something similar. I think that traffic and traffic patterns are much harder to change and know that many people depend on that section of I-70 for their daily commutes. Additionally, there are few good east-to-west arterials going through Denver. Thus it seems impossible for that section of highway to simply be abandoned. I think what would be most likely to happen if I-70 got re-routed would be that the existing section of highway would continue to see the same traffic but lose out on federal money earmarked to maintain the interstate highway system. Accordingly, I am writing to ask that you please not give any further consideration to the idea of rerouting I-70. I would, however, love to see a good concrete sound barrier to replace the wooden fences on I-70 in West Denver. Thank you

Very concerned about the proposed expansion of I-70. Try a different approach with Adams County regarding a re-route. Denver has repeatedly dumped crap in Adams Countys lap. Its not fair what has happened, as recently as this past year, with the airport. Adams County has a tremendous economic development opportunity with a re-route onto I-270 & I-76. As of now, most of those areas are un-developed, under-developed or blighted. Not sure how an underground highway with winter weather is a good option, think of Boston, MA and the big dig mess. How is traffic going to flow with expansion only east of the mousetrap. Seems like additional options need to be seriously explored before it's too late for this community and potentially NW Denver down the road.

Toll roads mean our public servants have failed. I've paid my taxes. These funds should be going to road improvement, or set aside for projects that might likely require more funds than be gathered in one year - like this I70 renovation. To even consider a toll road is like saying citizens deserve to get double taxed. I liken toll roads to football and baseball stadiums in major cities. Citizens are forced to pay for public football stadiums, where the revenue goes to private individuals. Our public servants have failed w budget after budget. We, rightful tax paying citizens, will end up paying more for a mismanaged, poorly budgeted, poorly planned project - and the public servants who failed end up being rewarded for their failure.

I am dismayed that the alternative that would route I-70 north with I-270 and I-76 was never fully considered. There are so many reasons that would be a better alternative, including: Taxpayer's \$: The "lid" is much more expensive than a reroute. Equity: The economic, environmental and health of people in Globeville, Elyria and Swansea have been disproportionately harmed by industry and freeways. Enough! It's time to rebuild their neighborhood, not continue the destruction. Safety: The "trench" is clearly a safety risk hazardous materials passing through flooding/icing during storms and the inevitable braking before tunnels that disturbs traffic patterns are all potential problems. There are many other issues the health of kids at Swansea Elementary (where my husband used to teach), real estate values, the possible impact on the east side of the mousetrap and more but will leave it here for now. The plan is not a good one and I expect those who are working on it to be willing to reassess where it is going an change course for the good of us North Denver residents. Thank you for your consideration.

I am opposed to the Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative on the grounds that the plan does not factor in trends in transportation for the 21st century. People in the 21st century are showing an increased propensity to reduce their use of cars. The Millennial generation, in particular, generally shuns driving and seeks out other modes of transportation, including public transportation, shared ride services, bicycling, and walking. They are choosing to make their homes in cities, either near their work or near public transit lines. They are also choosing to engage in work and social activities using mobile technologies that do not require driving to a physical location to connect. I encourage the decision-makers to review and understand the trends of this next generation of citizens. I reference the following reports and articles as supporting documentation: <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/APTA-Millennials-and-Mobility.pdf> <http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2014/05/04/peter-varga-millennials-transportation/8577831/>  
"The average American logged 7.6% fewer miles behind the wheel in 2012 than in 2004, when per-capita driving reached an all-time high. <http://www.ohiopirg.org/reports/ohp/new-direction> and <http://www.ohiopirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/A%20New%20Direction%20vOH.pdf> In addition, I do not believe the PIPA properly accounts for trends that we see in the 21st century for vehicle manufacturing. The emergence and increased use of autonomous vehicles will shape the future of surface transportation. Advanced levels of vehicle autonomy will be available in the next ten to twenty years. The use of autonomous vehicles will increase road safety and reduce congestion. I submit the following information as support for my argument and request that the decision-making team account for the future in its development of a solution for the I-70 corridor. <http://transport.house.gov/calendar/eventsingle.aspx?EventID=357149> Thank you.

To Whom It May Concern: I am a previous employee of Focus Points Family Resource Center, so I worked closely with the families of Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea. I am writing because I have remained close to some families, and they have expressed to me they are too scared to come to town hall meetings. I think the best way to get their opinions would be to go door-to-door with bilingual staff to speak directly with the community members, as this is how they communicate most effectively rather than through forms. In such person-to-person communications, several members have expressed to me they would prefer the rebuilding of the viaduct rather than a cover. A cover would force many families and businesses out of their homes with little compensation. Some families have been in these homes for decades, and other families have struggled to build what are now very successful businesses. I find it unethical to ever force a family out of their home, and I also would think it would be very much against the economic interest of Denver's powers-at-be to destroy profitable family businesses. I do not feel the I-70 East Expansion is attempting to get the full story of children, families, and businesses in the community. What are the real motivations here? Please do consider simply rebuilding the viaduct rather than tearing apart a community.

I am against the expansion of I-70. Please review new traffic research which shows that the more you expand, the more you will need to expand. Encourage other means of managing traffic rather than expanding lanes. I am against that expenditure of funds whether they be local or federal. I am against the chaos that will take place in an expansion of this type.

September 16, 2014

I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street Denver, CO 80222

EIS Team,

I write to you today with regard to the proposed I70 widening project in north Denver. I am asking as an architect, an urban planner, a Swansea property owner and a passionate advocate for the built environment that CDOT conduct an objective Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the full re-route option that includes both I-270 and I76. I understand that transportation design is one of the least recognized of the built environment. Though un-noticed by many and underappreciated by most, it is experienced nonetheless by virtually every Colorado resident on a daily basis. As you no doubt know, CDOT has a long tradition of design excellence. For example, the single-span Genesee Bridge was innovative for its time and continues to frame the Rocky Mountains for westbound I-70 traffic. Glenwood Canyon set new standards for ecologically sensitive design. More recently, the I25/I225 Transportation Expansion successfully integrated form and budget with stakeholder expectations. All these projects certainly faced financial challenges. But CDOT did the right thing, even if it was not the cheapest thing. That legacy is enshrined in the concrete and steel which forms those projects. CDOT's current preferred alternatives for widening I70 may be the most economically expedient options, but they are not the right options. I urge the design team to view the I70 expansion as an opportunity to continue the CDOT tradition of sensitive, thoughtful solutions to challenging problems. The sociological and economic cost of getting this wrong will have to be borne by future generations. We owe it to them to get it right.

The Draft Supplemental EIS that has been submitted for public comment is deficient because it does not represent the Draft Supplemental EIS as it exists today. Rather, according to the testimony of Brian Pinkerton of the Denver Department of Public Works at the September 17, 2014 meeting of the Neighborhood and Planning Committee of the Denver City Council, it represents the EIS at a "point in time approximately 9 months ago". Since that time the Colorado Department of Transportation has engaged in confidential negotiations with the City of Denver over issues such as the Vasquez Street interchange and storm water drainage. These negotiations were not open to public input. As a result, the EIS that has been submitted for public comment does not represent the de facto document as it exists today, and people are unable to comment on the actual document as it exists today. Hence, the process does not meet National Environmental Protection Act requirements.

I have called numerous times. I have written various letters...many letters regarding I do not want a recessed road on I-70. I am putting in this complaint in lieu of you starting that work because I do not want a recessed road on I-70. Thank you. Bye.

I am calling regarding the recessing of the road in the EIS program. I am totally against this. I was born in that neighborhood and I am calling on behalf of . I understand that she has written several letters to the city council and so I am wanting the recess of this road stopped. All they need to do is rebuild the viaduct. They don't need parks. They don't need toll roads. This is just another way for Denver to make more money that is not necessary. I am totally against this project.



Yes, I live in this 80216 zip code where they're going to put this...want to widen the highway. Why are you people wasting our time when you've already decided what you're going to do. The simplest and cheapest thing to do is move the school. You can save billions. Nobody, not very many people want that (inaudible) that is going to take longer, cost more money than it would to build...than to move the school. Move the school. That's the simplest thing because when you people came over here at the meeting, or on the telephone meeting, the guy that was leading the discussion said the committee decided it wouldn't be fair to split the neighborhood so they decided to leave the school where it was. Well the committee people don't live in this neighborhood and the committee people aren't going to be impacted by the mess it's going to make. Thank you for nothing. For wasting tax payers' money cause that's what it's going to be. You come to us and say but how are we going to pay for it. You know how you're going to pay for it; you're going to raise taxes.

I would like to be on record of being against the recessed section of I-70. And one of the reasons is that they had a tunnel over Stapleton Airway on I-70 at one time and it was nothing but accidents, constantly of people going into the tunnel from the sunshine. And this tunnel proposed recessed area would be even worse as traffic traveling from the east would be on the decline going into the tunnel and I'm sure it's going to be very unsafe. And the same would be true going west at sunset. And then, I'm wondering how you can access the recessed area...the park area on the recessed part of the thing without crossing frontage roads or roads that are quite heavily traveled. Thank you. And I'm interested in I-70 redevelopment because I go to church in the area of Elyria and so I feel quite concerned. Thank you.

I live in Cole Neighborhood and I definitely just wanted to comment that I like the preliminarily identified preferred alternative on the flyer that we saw regarding to what you guys are doing on the I-70 East. So, I definitely like it. I don't think there's a perfect alternative but this is certainly better than what's there now. Thank you. Feel free to call me if you'd like. Thanks. Bye.

The Draft Supplemental EIS process is deficient because a written evaluation of the draft EIS was apparently not performed prior to completion of the 2014 Draft Supplemental EIS. Per 23 CFR 771.129 "Re-evaluations," the purpose of the written evaluation is to determine whether or not a supplement to the draft EIS versus a new draft EIS is needed. The (PACT) Summary Report (October 2011) does not do this.

NO, no & no to this submerged I-70 expansion plan. First, its unnecessary, interstate traffic has been steadily declining for years. Secondly, it is well known that traffic only fills the highway almost as soon as it is built. Thirdly, the pollution and rerouted traffic to the rest of the city is unacceptable. And, the cost is unconscionable, given the major hit to all other infrastructure needs in the state. And lastly, it will not improve the surrounding communities as the project advocates claim, but will only further damage Globeville, Swansea & Elyria, especially per the prolonged exposures to digging up & trucking the ground of a radioactive superfund site.

The Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative does not change the traffic pattern from Peoria to I225 on the Eastbound side. The Peoria on ramp traffic still will be required to cross several lanes to stay on I70 East. A better alternative would have the Peoria traffic enter I70 after the I225 exit.

It seem that is the concern and safety for children that are attempting to cross just north of I-70 & the Union Pacific RR Over crossing (west to east) at 47th and York. Children are now attempting to beat the train before it cross the train train crossing. If the train comes to a stand still there are attempts to jump on the train and hop to the other side. This should be consider as a potential public relation disaster should a accident occur. It appears that from Brighton blvd the existing side walk is the best option to walk to the elementary school with regards of not having to deal with the train. But not a very desirable on for most people because of lack of appeal. More access for the neighborhood north of I-70 and west of the rail crossing at 47th and york should be consider. This may cut down unnecessary warnings from rail engineers (noise pollution )

It is apparent that CDOT learned nothing from the fiasco that was the Stapleton tunnels if you are considering "below grade" lanes with a park above it. Research the history of traffic flow and accident records that were a result of the tunnels. Or more current data can be obtained every winter by the traffic congestion on I-70 at the Eisenhower Tunnels. CDOT needs to get a history lesson.

CDOT has not exhibited much reliability in the upkeep of landscaped areas around the highways. What assurance do we have that the "landscaped cover" over the highway between Columbine and Clayton streets will not be neglected?

Dear I-70 East Project Team,

As a homeowner living 1.5 blocks from I-70 project, I have looked carefully at the plans for the reconstruction of the highway. I have lived in my home for 7 years, and in the Elyria-Swansea Neighbohood for 9 years before that. I know that there are already many problems with air, odor, and noise pollution in my neighborhood. I feel that this project will bring more problems to this neighborhood. The noise and air pollution during construction, and the traffic that the wider highway will bring to the neighborhood will make the quality of life in this area even worse than it is today. I have looked at the plan for mitigating the harmful effects of construction and the finished highway, and I do not believe that they will be enough. If I had the money, I would move out of this neighborhood before this project begins. I do not feel like CDOT has made an effort to get to know the concerns and the lifestyles of the people that live here, and that you have not made an effort to be fair to us. With a project that will affect our lives as much as this one will, I think that it would be fair for residents like me to have assistance in relocating to another area. This project will decrease the value of my home and my quality of life, and that is why I should be assisted with moving somewhere else. I am a senior on a fixed income, and cannot qualify for a mortgage to move to another part of the city. CDOT should help all nearby residents that want to relocate to do so. Each resident should be helped by real estate and finance experts in a relocation plan, and CDOT should both provide financial resources, and help residents to access funding available from other federal, state, and local governmenta, and from non-profit organizations and foundations.

Dear I-70 East Project Team,

As a homeowner living at 1.5 blocks from I-70 project, I have looked carefully at the plans for the reconstruction of the highway. I have lived in my home for 7 years, and in the Elyria-Swansea Neighborhood for 9 years before that. I know that there are already many problems with air, odor, and noise pollution in my neighborhood. I feel that this project will bring more problems to this neighborhood. The noise and air pollution during construction, and the traffic that the wider highway will bring to the neighborhood will make the quality of life in this area even worse than it is today. I have looked at the plan for mitigating the harmful effects of construction and the finished highway, and I do not believe that they will be enough. If I had the money, I would move out of this neighborhood before this project begins. I do not feel like CDOT has made an effort to get to know the concerns and the lifestyles of the people that live here, and that you have not made an effort to be fair to us. With a project that will affect our lives as much as this one will, I think that it would be fair for residents like me to have assistance in relocating to another area. This project will decrease the value of my home and my quality of life, and that is why I should be assisted with moving somewhere else. I am a senior on a fixed income, and cannot qualify for a mortgage to move to another part of the city. CDOT should help all nearby residents that want to relocate to do so. Each resident should be helped by real estate and finance experts in a relocation plan, and CDOT should both provide financial resources, and help residents to access funding available from other federal, state, and local governments, and from non-profit organizations and foundations.

I think this is a fantastic idea and wholeheartedly support this project.

I am so excited about this project! It is great to see CDOT addressing the current eyesore with a great plan that will again unite North Denver!

To Whom it May Concern, As a resident of north Denver and a taxpayer, here are my major concerns in the current I-70 expansion plan: The incredible amount of \$ this project will consume. Many believe it to be grossly-fiscally irresponsible spending from a taxpayer perspective, especially when the re-route appears it will cost about half as much while addressing I-70 congestion issues on BOTH sides of I-25, not just the east side. The expanded freeway and its new service roads will be well-within 100 feet of the wall of Swansea Elementary. Imagine the vibration, the pollution, the noise, the danger in getting to school which serves kids from both sides of the freeway]. These kids deserve better. Crashes will likely occur due to changes in light and irrational braking that occurs at the lights well as the areas that gets no direct sunlight in the wintertime. A freeway deep in a trench and bordered by sound walls gets no direct sunlight in many lanes in the wintertime. I am hopeful that CDOT reviews these comments and makes major changes to the current flawed plans. Thank you for your time

I am a home owner in the Sunnyside neighborhood. We have been in the community for nearly 10 years now. Our kids go to school in the neighborhood. We are invested. We believe this is a terrible idea for Denver and specifically our community. The proposal to widen I70 will be detrimental to our kids, our home and our community. The schools in Sunnyside and surrounding areas are very close to the highway. Many schools actually line the highway. There is no way to be able to widen the highway, that will not effect the outside air quality so close to the schools. Our kids deserve a place to play that it is free of smog and exhaust. If the expansion takes place, many of our kids will suffer. The proposal will also have huge implications on our property. It will cut off surrounding neighborhoods. It will negatively effect accessibility, noise control, property value, and much more. There are cities across America that are still suffering from poor decisions like the one being proposed. The proposal isn't creative, it doesn't take into account communal or environmental impacts. Those 2 pieces of the puzzle are aspects that CO should care deeply about. I believe a better proposal would be to reroute I70 north through I76 and turn the current I70 into a boulevard that creates more spaces for community to thrive. That will allow schools to become a safer place for our kids, our homes to remain a vital fabric of northwest Denver and our community to be one that is unified not divided. This is a bad idea. It is being done behind the effected communities. I will be very disappointed to call myself a Denver-ite if it is allowed to pass with so little community knowledge and support.

Expanding I-70 will eliminate 1/3 of the homes in the Elyria district. This proposal would never be considered if it were in Cherry creek. Expanding the road to 10 lanes will only increase air pollution negatively affecting the health of the people in that area. Adding five lanes of toll road is another perk for rich people at the expense of everyone else. The road should be routed outside of the city along I-76.

I do not support widening I-70. It will destroy neighborhoods. We need more, better mass transit. Expand light rail!

To Whom It May Concern: I oppose this proposal for a number of reasons, as a nearby resident, my family already suffers from the noise and pollution of I70. Widening the highway will only generate more filth in the air. I am aware of 11 schools in the EPA Impact Zone. I am concerned about years of ongoing commuter issues stemming from this project. I am concerned for my property values and those near me, especially in the hard hit neighborhoods of Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea. Given the impact that this project will have on those closest to it, I question why alternative solutions, especially those shown to shave as much as half the budget, have not been pursued further. Why has there been no study of a full re-route combining I-270 and I-76 in this SEIS? That solution seems to only save money, drive growth, resolve commuting issues, and open up depressed neighborhoods severed from the rest of Denver. Burying I-70 will result in maintenance costs far higher than a traditional surface road's in perpetuity. For all these reasons I implore my representatives, local leaders, and appointed officials to choose an alternate solution.

Please reroute I-70. We should be transforming our city into a beautiful place to live with quality neighborhoods. Please enhance our neighborhood as a safer and healthier place for our families and children. Please reroute I-70. I would like less air pollution and noise for my son!

I believe that this proposed widening of I70 will severely impact the air/noise quality in the proposed widening zone. I think that these neighborhoods have already suffered many years of less than ideal conditions. I have worked in the Swansea Elementary school, and now live in the Chaffee park neighborhood, and feel that I have seen first hand the effects on the neighborhood. I believe the proposed alternative route would be a better option for a thoroughfare through the city as it would impact less neighborhoods and thus people. Thank You.

To the I-70 East Project Team,  
Thank you for your e-mail. Unfortunately, I will be unable to attend the hearings because my internship for my Masters in Social Work is in Lafayette, so I could not get back in time. Also, Wednesday and Thursday are part of the major Jewish holiday Rosh Hashanah, so if there are any Jewish stakeholders, I imagine they will be unable to make it as well - I actually find it pretty ignorant this was overlooked. From what I know about the community, people do not feel comfortable going to these public hearings. The best way to get opinions is to go door to door, and speak directly with people in both English and Spanish. I am not sure if this is being done, or if flyers are just being left, which for this community, and any community for that matter, is an unacceptable way of informing the public. People need to be spoken with face to face in the comfort of their homes, not at a public meeting, where many are scared to go, which makes me wonder, is the office really concerned with truly hearing the public opinion, or do they just want to say they tried, and therefore not really take public opinion into consideration? I think the case is the latter, because I know this community intimately, and every person with whom I have had contact is against what will be done.  
So, the only conclusion I can make is that the office is just doing what in legal terms is called "CYA", or covering your trail (I am leaving out the actual profane word, a\*\*), and are not in fact truly concerned about the people in the neighborhood, which I find to be simply deplorable. We are talking about people's homes and businesses you are planning to completely uproot at little compensation. I also happen to have a friend who is an urban engineer, and the cover option is the most expensive option. So, I ask myself, why would you choose the most expensive option as opposed to simply reconstructing the viaduct or re-routing? What are your real motives? Are you trying to "beautify" this area because of the lightrail? Who are the funders of this project and the politics at stake? What are you NOT telling the community? Are you really morally ok with completely uprooting \*people - children and families\* - to beautify an area? And then I conclude that these "public hearings" are really a formality rather than actually caring about the people you are affecting. Otherwise, why would you neglect talking with people face to face in their homes, and schedule such hearings on a major Jewish holiday?  
I am planning on writing the Mayor, as well as informing my network as to what is really going on. This community has been taking advantage of enough - why don't you all step up to the plate and really truly try to cooperate and work with the families for once rather than destroy them? They have already had to live through SARCO - do you really want to be another notch in their marginalization yet again?

Hi, I just read an article about the proposal to put a portion of I-70 underground. I think it's great, but I also think there's more your agency can do. Instead of 'burying' the problem of congestion on the roads, how about exploring / encouraging alternatives to cars on the road. I drive from home in Aurora to Golden and I researched a path to take the bus and light-rail. It would take over 2 hours to make all the connections and transfers, which I find unfeasible and counter-intuitive. Well, I was in Las Vegas recently and got to experience their BRILLIANT Monorail while there. I went about 4 miles in less than 15 minutes. I know it doesn't sound like much, but this allowed me to avoid calling a cab and contributing to traffic snarl, pollution and frustration. Not to mention costs,,, the monorail only cost like \$3 round-trip. Anyways, I was in the Forney Museum of Transportation the other day and saw some fascinating sketches or, artist concepts from the '60s of a proposed 'Denver Monorail', that obviously was never given further consideration to make a reality. Why can't we make this happen though? I mean, it would impact the current infrastructure very little, with the concrete column footprints barely taking up more than a conventional highway median. Let's think wisely and act with foresight when considering these massive traffic-flow 'improvement' projects shall we? Thanks

Hi,  
With 30+ years of experience in USDOT and 10 years at the state DOT level, please take my comments seriously.  
Drop your expansion of I-70 as described in your flyer and look for an alternate I-70 reroute keeping the current I-70 for local traffic.  
Rationale: you are never going to solve your volume problem in the area described, just put it off to the next crises years from now. CDOT seems to react to problems rather than forecast traffic problems with early solutions. Just my observation.  
Good Luck in what ever you do

Start collecting tolls NOW!! .25 per mile, \$3.00 for the total length. We all know it needs to be done. Let's start paying for it now, bank the money, it can't be spent on anything else. Keep the tolls low, unlike E-470. (I've never driven on E-470, and I refuse to because the tolls are extremely high.) Hopefully, if we put money away for the project in advance, the federal government will match the funds and we'll have a good head start on paying for whatever the final design is.

Just purchased my home and am thrilled about the designs that incorporates the open space preferred below ground highway option. While this option is obviously more asthetically pleasing to the eye it also brings denver into a new and more safisticated era as well. I shall be attending all meetings regarding this option for development, and look forward to an exciting new approach that well bring bigger and better events(super bowl?)and help with the conjestion and safety issues of the existing stucture. If it is decided that the raised option is the route taken i and others will petition against it as it is not viable for a long term solution.. thanks justin brady a concerned and devoted new member to the Swansea community

I am not a fan of making 2 Toll lanes in each direction. With the majority of people not using the express toll, I do not see how this will help ease traffic for the masses. I would rather see 1 Toll lane in each direction and use the center (other 2 purposed toll lanes) for mass transit (light rail lines) like they have in other states. Using a light rail system down the center does not create an issue of having to gain access to additional land to put it in and it also would move the masses, help eliminate the volume of cars and pollution as well as help raise funds like toll lanes would.

This planned concept for the I-70 face lift on the face looks appealing. The thing I would hope CDOT learned from the community backlash of US-36 was to not outsource the highway to a third party and worst of all a foreign third party. If a private investor is used find one instate or at very least domestic source of income. Do not sell Colorado out to foreign interests.

No to more toll roads. If you ever have driven in a place like Chicago, toll roads are such a hassle. Drivers will avoid Colorado and Denver to avoid more tolls, less gas sales, restaurant sales, etc. The people who live next to I70 should've known what living next to an interstate was like, take the park off the top and it will cost millions less. Buy up some of those dump houses and make a park instead. Would be cheaper to move people out than build nice things around them.

I live in Green Valley Ranch and have done so since 1998. I realize I-70 is a mess, but I take exception to the two toll lanes that seem to me to favor the rich who can afford to use them. Except for perhaps those that live in Stapleton, many of us in northeast Denver, Montbello and Green Valley Ranch, who have to use this highway to get most places, do not have the funds to be able to use the toll lanes. I would hope that those of us that live so close to I-70, and at times have no recourse but to use I-70, will get some sort of a break on the price of a yearly pass. Thank you

No on Toll Lanes, HOV would be better - (optimistically) Plan to run future Light Rail out to DIA along similar route?

This is to express how very difficult it is to commute to jobs in Denver or Aurora for the many residents who live in communities to the east, because of the long-term one-lane construction closure on I70 between about Tower and Colfax. The closure began in February and it has been reported that it will last another year or two. The most frustrating part is crawling through the jam it creates everyday, yet seeing no crews, no equipment, nothing happening, week after week. I'm sure you know that this is a major interstate for trucks, tourists, as well as commuters and other residents. It has strangled communities like mine (Antelope Hills in unincorporated Arapahoe County) from reasonable access to jobs and services in the city. I think part of your study and planning for I 70 improvements should include focused attention on getting projects that are started completed in a reasonable time frame, especially when they involve significant lane closures such as that on I 70 to the east of Denver.

It still seems to me that the best alternative was never given serious consideration. That would be to re-route I-70 to the NE from a point just west of the National Western Complex to I-270 somewhere in the vicinity of Vasquez Blvd. Between their need for a new facility layout and your highway it seems like a good opportunity to make them both work together. North of the National Western grounds the route would be through junk yards, blighted land and more junk yards. Practically all of it could be constructed with no interference with existing I-70 traffic; the only interruption would be to finish the final connections at each end. Your statements that this project will help "mend" the Swansea neighborhood just doesn't hold water. As proposed, I understand construction will take around 4 years, this project will effectively kill that neighborhood, and some developer will conveniently be right there to build a bunch of apartments that the current residents won't be able to afford. In addition, whatever roadway you build there, that's it, you will have used up all available space; there will be no room for any adaptation for whatever unforeseen factors may surface in the future. I guess this just keeps a well-established Denver tradition going, that of building completely dysfunctional transportation infrastructure.

I do not support the proposed changes and do not want it in my neighborhood (Chaffee Park) in the future either. Reroute I-70 west of I-25 onto I-76 West and turn I-70 west of I-25 into a parkway so that Chaffee Park neighborhood and connect with Sunnyside neighborhood. Thanks.

My comments concern the potential echo of traffic noise coming out of the below grade roadway. Secondly, I'm concerned about gentrification of the neighborhood without working with the city of Denver to keep affordable housing in the long-term in this area. Thirdly, I would like to see a westbound interchange between E470 and I 76 to keep westbound (mountain traffic) of of this stretch of I-70. I drive for a mountain shuttle company and drive this stretch 5-6 times per week. I would much prefer an easier route to I-76 to bypass this area.

Enough of the toll lane issues! Why does every highway have to be a toll road? I'm sure there's enough funding coming in through other taxes, tickets, and other forms of revenue to cover this project. Pretty soon, no one will be able to drive on Colorado's highways because they're all toll roads! I understand that I-70 needs to be redone, there's no question about it. But it doesn't need to be made into yet another toll road. The design plans look nice, a little fancy for a highway, but a nice view from a plane.

I am opposed to any toll lanes and especially those contracted out. I-70 needs widening and improvements as I travel it daily. Is the cost for the "park" really appropriate for CDOT? I'm not sure that is needed - why not use that extra money so there would not be toll lanes. Are the planners looking for awards somewhere so they can show how community oriented and beautiful it will be? It is in a very industrialized part of town and should be utilitarian.

I belong to parenting group called Highland's Mommies. You maybe familiar with with Highlands Mommies, but if not, this group can be a very influential group as it has a following in the 1000. Recently, there has been a campaign from some of the members expressing their concerns for the I70 expansion and also suggesting an alternative route on 76. I'm sharing with you because I have some concerns about the info that has been passed around. The group of individuals spear heading this are using what feel to be misinformation and fear tactics to encourage member to speak out. They are stating that I70 west will eventually have to be expanded and that people living near I70W will eventually have their properties and values affected and this expansion is inevitable. This bothers me for many reasons. First, you are only speaking about I70 E. Nothing is being discussed about I70W at this time. I know this may change in the future but to speculate that this WILL happen is just misinformation. Two, many of these people are solely focusing on their Highlands neighborhood and not necessarily really concerned with the neighborhoods that will truly be effected, and that is why they are reaching out to you. Third, I question how many of these people actually have to drive these roadways everyday. My job is in sales and requires me to trek around the entire city on a daily basis. I spend countless hours on both 76 and 70. I think it would be detrimental to consider removing 70 w and forcing all traffic onto 76. We live in Golden and take 70 to the airport and downtown. 70 and 76 are probably the least congested roads that I travel on a daily basis. I am 100% against a reroute. Unfortunately the people who maybe suggesting this, never have to drive these roads on a daily basis or have to take potentially take a reroute that will add extra miles and time on the road, just to get downtown or to head south. They don't care because they downtown.

Thank you for taking the initiative on this project. I wanted to express that it is disappointing that additional lanes to I70 will be toll lanes. The highway could stand to have additional lanes for all tax payers, not just those who can afford to pay more. They should at least be HOV lanes. Thank you

Dear CDOT,

Lowering the freeway is a good idea. But the plan to create a park over I-70 is a bad idea. As a taxpayer I object strenuously to the extravagantly expensive kind of construction needed to build a truly vast bridge to support a park that will require lighting and create a hidden tunnel that must be lighted, video monitored and have special plumbing infrastructure. It takes an enormous amount of bridge structure to support all that soil and water and infrastructure for the park. Also, real parks should have real trees with deep roots. A park on a bridge can't accommodate permanent large trees. What goes up must eventually come down. If you build a heavy park on an extended bridge then someday, that bridge will crumble and the taxpayer will be hit again. A better solution would be to go ahead and lower the freeway and erect attractive sound walls to reduce noise. Then buy some of that cheap residential-industrial property adjacent to I-70 in Elyria and Swansea neighborhood to build a park ON THE GROUND or build a thin green zone on each side of I-70. Just build parks on the ground where they belong. Save the taxpayers a vast fortune.

There is no way a large semi or in our case a crane can easily maneuver a round-about at the Vasquez/Steele Street exit. There is already so much congestion at this exit and these will make movement a complete nightmare. There has to be reasonable access for trucks on this exit. It is an integral part of our daily traffic flow.

Hi! Please consider a re-route alternative instead of widening the highway at any location. We live a 1/2 block north of I70 near Federal. I'd be thrilled if a more "modern", cost-effective and environmentally-friendly approach meant that I 70 was elsewhere and our neighborhoods were less divided geographically. Thank you

I am highly opposed to this project and feel it will divide these neighborhoods from the rest of the city even more than they already are. I have read that the re-routing of I-70 to 270 and 76 is off the table, but I so wish that it was still an option as I think it would be much better for these neighborhoods and the city as a whole.

Dear Friends,

It is time to once again take a page from the California book of highways. You know - the place where traffic zooms along at 70+ miles per hr. (even where the posted limit is 55.) Let me take moment to point out a basic flaw or two in your proposal as follows: 1. a below grade I-70 would be subject to flooding: See I-25 south after a heavy summer downpour. 2. By putting a 4 acre cap over the top (to connect the neighborhoods) you will essentially be making a tunnel. Is anyone at CDOT old enough to remember the constant bottleneck at the airport tunnels? People will naturally slow down when entering a dark tunnel. (You will never be able to light it well enough to equal daylight). 3. Where will traffic be directed to when under construction?

Please consider this alternative proposal: Why not go north of the existing elevated portion? In fact go completely north of Swansea & through the industrial area at about where Race Ct. is presently - reconnecting at I-25 & Washington? Or even better: Make I-270 the new I-70 & simply widen to accommodate more traffic.

I live close to I-70 now, 3 houses away on Zuni and 48th. The noise is so loud and the pollution is obvious. I know I chose to live here but if I had known how bad it really would be I would have chosen a different neighborhood. The idea of widening I-70 would increase pollution and noise for sure. I urge you please go with a solution that will not uproot families and the environment. How would you feel if it was your home and the air you and your children breathed in every day?

1.) I was surprised to see the area of traffic impact did not include MLK Blvd. I live in Stapleton and I believe this roadway will be used as an alternative route during construction. I will use MLK during construction rather than I-70. Construction sequencing and impacts should include additional analysis to minimize impacts during construction. Specific to MLK, construction impacts could be mitigated by making improvements to the roadway between Havana Way and Peoria (currently one lane each direction), which will provide a by-pass between I-225 and downtown. There is also the East Corridor that should pick-up additional riders during construction. Cooperation with RTD/DTP should be explored further. This likely will affect parking demand at Central Park, Peoria, 40th/Airport. The P3 contract also needs to state that the contractor maintain existing bike paths during construction. The Sand Creek trail has the potential to be used for staging/etc during construction unless the contract specifically states this needs to be mitigated. 2.) I support the P3 financing of the project. I think CDOT had a rough roll-out for US-36, but hopefully some lessons have been learned. I believe this provides a viable funding mechanism to traditional funding routes. I sympathize with the concern that there will be toll lanes, but people need to write their congressperson and tell them to quit fighting about inconsequential stuff like gay marriage and actually fund infrastructure. The P3 contract can be written in such a way that each team could propose specific ways to generate additional revenue to help support the capital cost of the project. I'm specifically thinking of encouraging the private sector to propose ideas that utilize the second cover (eastern most) to develop the adjacent land to a highest and best use. On cursory review, it looks like prime real estate will be available around this area. 3.) I would caution the project team to get all IGAs in place early. Specifically, CCD will try and expand the scope of the drainage feature to provide an open cut drainage feature. This will be a way for them to get 'free' upgrades to the redevelopment of the shockshow property. Making the drainage feature in this area a public asset seems like a reasonable idea; HOWEVER, CCD and the stockshow should pay their fair share of the cost. 4.) I am a bit concerned with the freeze/thaw issues the cover alternative creates. This has created some issues on TREX, including a fatal accident that occurred this past winter that is at least partially caused by the shadowing affect from the suppressed section ([http://www.denverpost.com/weathernews/ci\\_25254464/snow-related-accidents-close-westbound-i-70-at](http://www.denverpost.com/weathernews/ci_25254464/snow-related-accidents-close-westbound-i-70-at)). Design should try and address this issue. I don't think the only solution should be to use MAG chloride/sand during operations. Again, the P3 contract can be written in such a way to encourage the bidding teams to address this concern. Some out of the box ideas like heating the road should be explored, not discarded off the bat because it is 'unproven technology' or not 'cost effective'. Serious accidents have compounding costs that often are not considered. 5.) I would like to see the roadway cross-section that includes a bike path. This doesn't need to be immediate adjacent to I-70 in all circumstances, but a route that diverges from the Sand Creek path to maintain a more east/west route that parallels I-70 will make this a viable biking corridor from Stapleton to Downtown. The current route follows the sand creek until it connects with the Platte trail, too out-of-direction to be used as an alternative from Stapleton to downtown. Also provides recreational value, which is valued by the community.

I am a Denver resident and I oppose the I-70 widening plan. Having a highway run through neighborhoods was a bad idea the first time, why make the same mistake twice. It seems like a quick fix that ignores the current and the future trend of mixed use, urban core growth that is booming in Denver. I strongly urge you to consider the re-route option. It's win, win. As an educator and environmental advocate, having a highway so close (underneath!!!) to schools, neighborhoods is not smart planning. It's costly; financially, environmentally, health wise as well as its continued impact on these neighborhoods. Please reconsider this option and look at the reroute alternative. It's better for the kids, it's better for property and homeowners and it's better for the environment. It's a move that benefits all.

I'm not a resident of the I-70 corridor, but I do think this project, as outlined in the preliminary preferred plan, could be an exciting update for the Denver area. I do frequent the Elyria/Swansea and Globeville neighborhoods, and I think the partially covered highway, including parks, would benefit these neighborhoods. However, I am extremely concerned that this is going to become another case where the HPTE and CDOT give private investors too much control over and ability to profit from something that should be a public space or service. If investment in the project is attractive to a private party, why can't the same deal be made with the city of Denver? I think it is tragic if a private interest is longer-sighted than our own collective interest, as manifested by our government. Please don't sell our futures out to the 1%. At the very least, please make continued PUBLIC, not PRIVATE ownership over the roadways a real priority.

I own (and have for 15 years) a property in the Clayton Neighborhood of Denver and plan to retire there in my old age. I support the elimination of the viaduct and dropping it (similar to I-25/the narrows). My concern is the walkability plans for the neighborhoods immediately surrounding the project. The neighborhood improvements and streets should maintain scale as neighborhood streets, transit should be planned for, wide DETACHED sidewalks and (dedicated/green) bike lanes should be added allowing safe access to transit, neighborhood amenities, etc. And the same should be true for any new on-off interstate lanes that may need to be added within the neighborhood (think complete streets). This is a legacy project and CDOT and Denver have an opportunity to do this right - please enlist pedestrian and place-making designers to not rip up the neighborhood as was done when the viaduct was built. Make the neighborhoods the focus. This project will bring new and well-deserved vitality to these neighborhoods when finished - build the project as if you lived there.

THIS AREA HAS A REAL STRONG SENSE OF COMMUNITY, A FEELING OF BELONGING, PEOPLE HAVE LIVED HERE FOR GENERATIONS& IT IS A PLACE WHERE WE CALL "HOME". SO WHEN THE COUNTY SAYS, "HOMEOWNERS ARE WELL COMPENSATED FOR THEIR HOMES &/OR BUSINESSES" (IF THEY ARE THE ONES BEING IMPACTED)IT IS NOT BE THAT COMFORTING!!! A SENIOR CITIZEN MAY NOT BE ABLE TO FIND ANOTHER PLACE TO LIVE THAT BRINGS AS MUCH COMFORT AS THEY FIND IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD. ANOTHER CONCERN IS - IN 20 YEARS, THIS REVISED PLAN WILL BE PASSE IF THE GROWTH IN COLORADO CONTINUES, THEN WHAT? IS THAT USING GOOD PREDICTIVE SKILLS, I THINK NOT? THANK YOU

I came tonight because of my interest in this project as a someone who lives in an area of Denver that is the vision of what many opponents tonight want I-70 to turn into. I live in a neighborhood that is near Colorado Blvd. between some of the most busiest parts of the road from Mexico Avenue to 8th Avenue. Many people tonight say they want a urban blvd but they do not realize that what they would end up getting is Colorado Blvd. The busiest road in Colorado is smelly, dangerous, polluting to the air, and very very noisy. 46th Avenue would steal the award as the worst road in Colorado from Colorado Blvd. I would pray for Colorado Blvd to be dug down and had a lid put over the most used portions. These people do not realize the answer from a prayer that they are getting. I do not think the lexus lanes are a great part of this project and should only be used for HOV lanes, but I do believe that the practice of digging the highway down is great. I have been to Seattle and seen the lid on their highway that goes through downtown and it is not loud or obtrusive to the neighborhood. Infact it is very nice and a very desirable part of town to go too. There are a lot of alarmist tonight, and I am one of them. The alarm I ring though is quite different from the one others are clanging. As a user of I-70 and someone who sees the economic commerce based iporatnce of I-70 for the commuters and the commerce of trucks, I think that keeping i-70 in tact is very important. I would not think that a Colorado Blvd through the Swansea neighborhood is what many people here tonight think it would be. They think it would take their neighborhood back to the 1880's but it would not. It would devistate the safer streets that lay off of I-70 with cut through traffic. This is not what they want, but what you are being effected by NIMBA it is hard to see that what you want can actually hurt you. The money spent on this project would be a well spent investment in the future of Denver and American commerce. People like Councilwoman Montero say that mass transit would be essential instead of a new safer highway, but I rememeber that there is already the construction of a lightrail train going through this neighborhood using hte Union Pacific right of way leases, and this is one step ahead of the TRES project many people quoted as being better than this I-70 East project. There are a lot of interest here tonight, and I do not offer my opinion as fact, as the only answer, as the bible, or as the final answer, but I offer it as a warning to people whose minds might be swayed by the passionate calls of strong speakers with insightful words who may not have fully thought through the impacts of their ideas, only knowing what they don't want. Maybe a the digg idea is not the best for the passionate nastagics but it is a viable median between a viaduct and a surface blvd. The idea allows for appealing sightlines, controllable ingress and egress, and a safer more stable raod for the future.

How far to the managed lanes go to? Sorry, I am having trouble seeing this. Do they go all the way Tower Road? Right now I-70 is four lane between Central Park and past Peoria. If there are going to be 3 general purposedlanes all the to Tower Road, does this mean a current general purpose is lane being eliminated between Central Park and 225? It seems CDOT sure is adding a lot of toll roads recently. There is US 36 between Boulder and Denver, the Twin Tunnels, and now this. Why can't the I-70 East Project be financed like the T-REX project of I-25? Thanks

Your public comment meetings occur on the Jewish high holidays this week. Certain you know that, right? Totally unacceptable, but typical.

As a voter I urge CDOT to do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. This is a world class city. Other world class cities: San Francisco, Boston, London have looked at the science and found freeways, especially the addition of lanes were not the best option for traffic! Please Colorado think big.

The issues of safety, congestion, transportation are important to the long-term development of Denver, well beyond 2035. The Viaduct needs attention, but increasing capacity on this corridor is short sighted. Modern urban planning and planning for the long-term should connect neighborhoods and commercial districts within the city to each other with transportation planning. It is time to route the heavy industrial and transit traffic around the neighborhoods rather than through them as the current I-70 route now does. The I270 and I76 by-pass should be increased to take noise, congestion, and all traffic transiting through the metro area out of the neighborhoods surrounding I-70. That increases the distance for these drivers by less than two miles, and routes that traffic through industrial, non-residential areas of the city. Increase those lanes and efficiency to reduce the negative impacts of traffic within the city limits. It makes much more sense to REDUCE traffic on the urban corridor of I-70 and RECONNECT the neighborhoods currently sliced through and separated in two by the old, out-dated, crumbling structure of the viaduct and I-70. Denver has grown beyond that route's service. That valuable land should be turned into a boulevard with limited transit traffic with parks and areas for commercial development and growth. CDOT, Federal transportation planners should be planning for 2100, not 2035.

I urge you to consider the I-270/I76 Reroute. These highways are already built, not heavily used and do not pass through any residential areas. I urge CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-6 As a north Denver resident, taxpayer and parks and recreation user, I am extremely concerned about the eventual and inevitable impact of this project on the west side of I 25. The Berkley Lake park was just recently renovated and many families enjoy both the park and Willis Case golf course. I feel I-70 expansion would have a very negative impact on the quality of life in North Denver which is currently undergoing quite a revitalization and boom. Why do you want to stop that by adding more noise, traffic and pollution?

We need more space for life. Time for life. And life means time for friends, family, children, gardens, good times with good food, experiences through communication and play, good air, good causes, social commitment, and care of the people, old, young, all ages. That expansion I-70 means more time of our lives dedicated to work, working hours to pay with more time for work, pollution, profit of the big corporations, etc. and less time for life. Time for that shiny personal bubble that gives the illusion of vast personal control while in many ways controlling us. The car, as a system, is a comfort zone, a suit of armor, an expandable, swollen ego. So cars are bubbles we blow to isolate ourselves from anything too closely resembling reality. In many respects, cars, as a stream of power, is the best powerful way to defeat communities and weaken them badly. Those big fat highways will give us more speed-without-movement and control-without-connection. This is a very strong anesthesia that puts us in danger of destroying our minds, our relations, our environment, our lives. Those insane and unsustainable crazy projects are for safety and control, but it is a safety and control that creates a bubble in which there is no threat, but also it holds no possibility of excitement. Will there be room for more cars? Does that mean there will not be room for our children to play? Is there room for more life, and less wasting our time and energy? Is there something more stupid than that?

Rerouting the highway along I-76 just makes good sense (fiscally and environmentally). Please make the right choice for our city and it's citizens.

The alternative, "Rebuild I70 in place is short sided, ignorant and lacking foresight into a future absent the passenger car". The bypass or an continuation of C470 through Golden to the northwest parkway is a better use of substantially less funds, i.e. "we don't need no stinking I70 in the central corridor". The alternative is going to make us all choke to death in the stench of gasoline and diesel exhaust. I sincerely hope this project ceases and you folks quit wasting our money.

The greatest concern I have falls under the category of environmental justice as it applies to the low- income neighborhoods and minority populations affected by the changes. Property acquisition will happen in all three alternatives so my concern is in the relocation aspect. It is encouraging to hear that there will be relocation benefits, but is that enough to justify the actions taken? Physical widening of the highway results in the acquisition of homes within the established neighborhoods, but is widening the best solution to mitigate the traffic and congestion, especially at the expense of relocating homes? Will the problem come up again in another 20 years with an increasing Front Range population? The vision for this section of the I-70 corridor is to serve as a multi-modal interstate freeway and rapid transit corridor serving regional and statewide trips, but I think inherent in that vision are those that live in proximity to this highway. Since congestion is of such concern with growing demands, it seems that alternate modes of transport should be encouraged.

To whom it may concern, My family has lived in North Denver for over 100 years. We sadly experienced the construction of I-70 through our neighborhood during the early 1960's. This project over 50 years ago had a devastating effect, literally dividing countless neighborhoods from Colorado Blvd. to Wadsworth! It was a mistake then and it will be a mistake now if we allow a widening of the same route. What makes sense is to rectify our half century mistake by re-routing I-70 to a route following I-270/I-76. This is the same route we should have followed 50 years ago. This new route is much less devisive as it disrupts fewer neighborhoods as it passes through mainly industrial neighborhoods. It would additionally save money over digging a ten lane trench through Swansea. This re-routing of I-70 would finally give us a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to unify our splintered neighborhoods by rectifying the sins of civic leaders a half a century ago. All one has to do is! study the effects of an elevated highway on the Embarcadero section of San Francisco. This project ruined the wonderful character of Fisherman's Wharf for years. Thankfully, the earthquake of 1989 required this elevated interstate highway to be demolished. What replaced it was a common sense plan of simple surface streets and trolley cars that make this area a mecca for tourism and local residents!! Today is our chance to make things right for the beleaguered neighbors of North Denver. Let's do what San Francisco did. Please, seize this rare opportunity! Thank you.

The proposed route will be disturbing one of the most polluted areas in Denver. I feel that the neighborhoods surrounding the area cannot be made safe from the hazardous dust that will be generated. This area is one of Denver's oldest neighborhoods and should remain whole, without an interstate running through it. The identified alternative is my reference since it will direct traffic around residential neighborhoods. This will benefit not only the Globeville area, but most of North West Denver. All of our neighborhoods will once again be connected without a highway dividing them. A day at the parks in North Denver would be more enjoyable without seeing and hearing the traffic from the highway. Our feeder streets will become less congested with large trucks once the alternate route is in place.

I concur that the cover over the existing I-70 is the preferred route, providing that issues of noise, drainage, access and utilization of the top cover for community uses, such as a park, are implemented. Also, it is critical that residents on both sides of the cover have access to activities on both sides. I question whether ten lanes of traffic are required for the most feasible and economically viable solution. The question of future use of the auto and the projections showing substantial increases in the future should be further evaluated. I do not believe that the proposed roundabouts at Vasquez should be implemented. I believe that it will create confusion and restrict traffic flow. A further concern is that the access ramps to get to downtown Denver are not sufficient and will create major traffic jams. The Brighton corridor is already at capacity without consideration of flows because of the new National Western Complex and the neighborhood plan from Bright Boulevard to 31st to 38th to be an urban center with bikes paths, stoplights and traffic calming. Washington is not a viable access to downtown through Brighton Boulevard or a continuation of the Washington underpass. The Washington underpass narrows to one lane and is dangerous. If it were to be enlarged, it could provide a means of getting to many downtown areas. Park Avenue is likewise bumper to bumper in mornings and evenings and clearly the additional traffic projected on I70 will merely make the situation worse. Speer Boulevard may be the more promising access but it requires promoting traffic through limited number of streets in downtown. It is essential that the City and State consider additional or improved off ramps so as not to cause further congestion to the downtown area. With more than a billion dollars of road improvements, the effect should not be to cause much greater congestion downtown. A portion of the funding must be dedicated to resolving this issue.

The widening of I-70 in its current location continues the ongoing destruction of Denver's north neighborhoods and ruins our property values. Furthermore, I have called about weeds (8-12 feet tall) along the I-70 right-of way for years. My request for maintenance have been totally ignored. The corridor is a disgrace of weeds, trash and graffiti. If they can't keep the corridor up now, what will it look like when there is more to maintain? It should be moved north where there will be less residential and environmental impact. Further, if Brighton Blvd. becomes the gateway, maybe the city can take better care of this area so tourists and visitors are greeted with on attractive area and not a weed invested garbage dump that the elevated portion is now.

There has been an alternative presented to the I-70 Expansion. This reroute via 270 seems reasonable and well thought out. The time is now to fix a 50 year old mistake. The proposed I-70 expansion is a continuation of poor planning and lack of vision.

This is all moving too fast given that the SDEIS is based on insufficient data. Before moving forward, CDOT owes it to every citizen affected by the current plan to study the I-270 / I76 re-route plan. That plan would cost less, do a better job of improving the quality of life in more affected neighborhoods, stimulate the economy of those neighborhoods, and ultimately provide a safer highway travel experience in the years to come. At least that's how I see it. Others disagree. Let's find out! With more data, we can go to discuss our responsibility to historic neighborhoods that were seriously damaged by the initial construction of I-70. This is the perfect time to start fixing that situation. Why would we pass up the conversation?????

I-70 needs to be diverted to I-76. This plan to widen the highway or build underground is so unbelievably dumb that I can't believe it's still being discussed I live on the west side of I-70 and it obvious Cdot will be coming our way with with an equally as dumb plan if they widen I-70 on the East side. I-70 already destroyed our neighborhoods for no good reason, lets correct the past mistake and create good planing for the future.

PORK PARK A colossal waste of money The transportation infrastructure across Colorado and the United States is falling apart and tens of billions of dollars are desperately needed to repair the system so why have CDOT and the City of Denver been playing Russian Roulette with commuters lives for over a decade while the I-70 viaduct continues to crumble? The City of Denver doesn't care which option is best for the travelling public but which option will ensure gentrification of the surrounding neighborhood. For 10 years the City pushed the re-alignment option and laughed at the tunnel proponents but when they couldn't convince the neighborhoods or CDOT that the re-alignment was the best option suddenly its let's do a depressed bathtub tunnel design and force the taxpayers to spend an extra \$300 million building Pork Park the inevitable cost overruns from downplaying the impacts will push the cost difference to half a billion dollars. Denver and DOT have been trying to prove that building Pork Park is the best option for all the people that use I-70. In order to justify this outrageous waste of desperately needed transportation money CDOT and Denver have resorted to deception in order to claim that it is only \$150 million more to build Pork Park but in order to arrive at this manipulated number they forced through changes to the Viaduct options in the name of community connectivity which forced the cost of this option up by \$150 million thus they are no longer comparing similar designs. If that additional connectivity is required than it is required for all options. The Pork Park cost estimate also does not include the sunk cost of tearing down several hundred feet of the relatively new viaduct to the west of Brighton Boulevard and lowering Brighton Boulevard in order to get I-70 down under the railroads tracks a few hundred feet to the east which just increases the cost differential. The Pork Park evaluation also greatly downplays the cost of excavating through contaminated soil, bedrock and the drainage problems caused by the proposed highway being lower than the water table and getting storm water up out of the bathtub. These un-needed design changes to the viaduct option decreased traffic level of service and forced up the cost of the project in order to make the Pork Park option look better than it really is and they are telling the public the Pork Park option increases access and mobility when the design says the opposite because every one knows if you repeat a lie often enough the public believes it.

From the public meeting boards regarding connectivity: Viaduct North/South design option has crossings at York, Josephine, Columbine, Elizabeth, Clayton, Fillmore and Steele streets and Interchanges at Brighton, Colorado and Steele. Lowered Bathtub design option with Pork Park North/South has crossings at York, Josephine, Columbine, Clayton, and Steele streets and Interchanges at Brighton and Colorado. This clearly shows decreased access and mobility (2 less street crossings and 1 less interchange) and removing the Steele interchange will force more truck traffic off the interstate and onto 46th Ave right between the schools and Pork Park. The revised Viaduct option will have three traffic signals on Steele Street in 300 feet which will cause a traffic level of service F from day one which also makes this option look worse. The City and CDOT have been telling the public that the Pork Park design has fewer community impacts and won't impact the school. But the fact is the Pork Park design impacts 33 more houses (a 60% increase) and five more businesses and in both options the School could potentially be saved. If CDOT buries this section of highway every time CDOT does another EIS people are going to want a tunnel, as I recall Vail wants I-70 to tunnel under the mountain. People of Vail here is a hint: build low income housing next to the highway. This project is about re-building a highway not balancing the ledger, righting a perceived wrong, building parks, basketball courts or whatever Fantasy Pork they dream up next next they will be asking for this project to force the taxpayers to rebuild the entire NWSS complex and neighborhood. It is willy-nilly spending and Pork Stuffing like this that gives us trillion dollar debts. For \$300+ million the taxpayers could buy every house/business in the neighbourhood and convert it to open space with \$200+ million in change, or the taxpayers can sell it to Nation Western both of which are better options than spending \$300 million on a park. It is time for commuters and taxpayers across Colorado to stand up and tell CDOT not to waste \$300 million taxpayers dollars to build Pork Park.

Dear CDOT, As a north Denver resident, a teacher, and soon to be father, I must vehemently plead that the current CDOT proposal is not approved. EPA studies directly link traffic related air pollution with increases in respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. The alternative of re-routing I-70 north through the industrial, less-inhabited areas of 270 and 76 is the only viable option for CDOT to do the right thing and stop I-70 from continuing to harm us. Currently, I-70 runs directly through several neighborhoods, exposing those nearby to contaminated air. With knowledge of current EPA studies about the health effects of traffic related air pollution, exacerbating the pollution by widening the freeway is nothing short of criminal, let alone morally irresponsible. For the safety of myself and those close to me, I (with the support of my neighbors, family, and friends) will fight this proposal to the end. Denver ranks 5th in the U.S. for man-made environmental hazards. Stop it! The amount of sellable commercial and residential space created by turning this section of I-70 into a boulevard instead of extra lanes and extra on/off ramps should be assessed by a party not affiliated with CDOT. If CDOT says that this project is a non-starter due to funding, I say try harder. Our lives depend on it! The boulevard would revive dead spaces of land currently destroyed by I-70 in the form of dead-ends. The benefits from the revival of these spaces and neighborhoods is endless. Compare L.A. 405 widening to the Embarcadero and Central Freeway replacements in San Francisco. The 405 in L.A. is worse than ever, as San Francisco is experiencing a revival of neighborhoods and decreased congestion and pollution. I intend to contact every elected state and local official, and I will urge everyone I know to do the same. Please contact me with any questions. Thank you for your time. <http://www.publichealth.lacounty.gov/eh/docs/AQinFreeways.pdf>

<http://www.scpes.ucla.edu/news/Freeway.pdf>

<http://www.preservenet.com/freeways/FreewaysCentral.html>

<http://www.latimes.com/science/la-me-freeway-air-20140515-story.html>

I am 100% against the I-70 expansion!!! Please do not do this to our environment and our people. There are other solutions, this is not a good one.



The seizing of property through eminent domain is a gross violation of human rights. It is stealing and in the worst possible way. No democratic process makes the act of taking that which belongs to another acceptable. This plan means stealing homes from the families that rightfully own them for the convenience of through traffic. Serving "the greater good" is a lie the ruling class tells itself to justify its misdeeds. Is evicting families from their homes so truck drivers from Iowa can make it to California 20 minutes faster really serving a greater good? The only people that stand to benefit from this are the construction companies that get the contracts and it comes at the expense of the Colorado resident (especially those losing their homes), and every other CDOT project statewide. I would like to ask those with final say in this matter this question, "Are you trying to turn Denver into Detroit?" You're doing a fine job

I am very concerned that enlarging I-70, creating a trench, and greatly increasing traffic through north Denver will be very detrimental to the health and well-being of those who live in the neighborhood. I am a physician with a degree in Public Health. I have reviewed the City of Denver health data, showing that the urban neighborhoods involved, Swansea, Elyria and Globeville already have an increased prevalence of cardiovascular dis. and childhood asthma. This may well be due to the current level of air pollution from I-70, and will only be made worse by the increased traffic this project will bring. In addition, these historic neighborhoods will be even more fragmented and further damaged by the currently proposed project. I believe a much better approach would be to re-route I-70 through I-270 and I-76, through Commerce City. This is already an industrial area, with considerable of room for expansion, with a much lower population exposure and better dispersion of pollutants.

I am writing as a concerned resident of the Berkeley neighborhood. The following are my concerns/comments regarding the planned I-70 expansion:  
-- Why was the full re-route that is on both the I-270 and I-76 not studied as part of the SEIS?  
--I'm concerned about the health impacts of increased air pollution on the students attending Swansea Elementary school as well as the residents of the neighborhoods adjacent to an expanded I-70.  
--I'm very concerned about the impact of eminent domain on the homeowners in the proposed construction zone -- not having a choice about wanting to sell/not sell one's home seems extremely unfair.  
--As an almost daily user of either Berkeley park or Rocky Mountain Lake park, I'm extremely concerned that at some point the widening of the I-70 will extend further west than what is currently being proposed and that these two parks would be obliterated or VERY negatively effected.  
Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration

My household is vehemently OPPOSED to the proposal for the current changes to I-70. I want to explore options to reroute the road outside of the urban area and around the city, especially for trucks passing through. It's an outdated and anti-urban renewal idea to widen the freeway through our most populated areas. This plan is not appropriate, will be bad for Denver and ultimately bad for any property owners along I-70. We should be working to reduce traffic, noise, environmental impact within the city and rerouting that through other suburban or less densely populated areas.

The proposed I-70 East project seems at best unnecessary and at worst a poor use of funds, an environmental hazard and the worst of already identified alternatives. I have read in detail the arguments for and against. I am deeply concerned about the impact of excavations that disturb hazardous materials and transport them near our northern neighborhoods. Further, it is my understanding that traffic on I-70 has been decreasing and that there are practical alternatives using route already in existing. The prospect of a huge new underground stretch that is not really in line with our traffic needs is appalling. I am totally aligned with the comment of our auditor, Dennis Gallagher. Please respond to our pleas and drop this project. Our communities will thank you.

I am very concerned about this new project. My family has lived in Swansea since 1956. We have experienced very few changes throughout the years. Our families are already exposed to the industrial environment. We do not need to Add more hazardous material to the air that our families breath.

I-70 through North Denver is a major source of air pollution, which manifestly damages the health and quality of life of residents within half a mile of the freeway. The expansion of I-70 will worsen the existing situation, further affecting the same people who already endure this disadvantage. No meaningful mitigation of this harm is possible unless the highway is relocated. The reroute is the only real mitigation. Therefore, the present DSEIS should include a thorough evaluation and analysis of the re-route alternative. Also, the amount of dollars this project will consume would be simply outrageous. Many believe it to be grossly-fiscally irresponsible spending from a taxpayer perspective, especially when the re-route would cost about half as much, while addressing I-70 congestion issues BOTH east and west of I-25, not just the east side. Do we really need the freeway practically three times the width compared to what we have now? Do we need four new toll lanes?

I live in Swansea a block off the highway. This is a terrible idea and it will not relieve congestion in the long run. You build a bigger road and you get people commuting from farther away and the same problems. Half if my block will be demolished for toll lanes for people w/ money to drive over the houses of my non-rich neighbors. As if we aren't already tired of the highway, they want to expand it and bring it closer. The future needs to be smart transportation, not more cars. This project is a terrible idea and I will have to live a block from it for the rest of my life. Cdot is manipulative and is trying to win this debate with propaganda. I wish I had become active in this debate sooner. I will be voicing my opinion at the ballot box. This is a terrible idea. Denver needs to look to its future. This is HUGE.

Hi, I recently purchased a home in Globeville, and live about a block away from the junction of I-25/I-70. From what I understand, the section of I-70 that I am closest to will not change, but a widening of I-70 further east is likely to separate Globeville and Elyria-Swansea even more from the rest of Denver than it already is. How will the addition of a cover over a small patch of highway help integrate these neighborhoods back into the rest of the city? This cap sounds more like an afterthought, similar to how almost every exit to Washington Street in my area feels like an afterthought - city planning never fully considered these neighborhoods when they were routing one of the United States' major arteries. I am worried about the air quality in these neighborhoods. A study has shown that people in my area live 3.5 years less on average than Denver as a whole. Add 4 extra 'luxury' lanes, and how much worse will it become in these neighborhoods? Lowering the highway underground will not mitigate surrounding air pollution. I used to live in Texas, and have driven the stretch of Dallas on I-35 that is similar to what you are planning. While it may work there, they do not have the type of climate we have here. Not allowing for direct sunlight will leave many spots iced over in the winter, and no place for the plowed snow to go, but to pile up on the sides, allowing for no shoulder. Are you going to suck out the snow with a vacuum? Doesn't that cost a lot of money? Aren't we spending a billion+ on constructing this trench? Additionally, much of this area is in the South Platte River flood plain, or damn near it! An entire highway submerged? Flooding may not happen very often, but it is potentially a huge problem, and you are inviting trouble by digging a hole. The money that you are proposing to use for this expansion will take away from the funds intended for bridge repair and upkeep in our state. All across America, bridges are falling apart from about 50+ years of neglect. If we take an already failing bridge support system and neglect it for another 8.5 years, how many extra millions of dollars are we going to have to spend later to fix or replace these bridges? How many people will lose their lives due to bridge collapse? I don't know, do you? I don't want to find out! Do you? I am not sure how many people from my area have come forward to voice their opinion, but there are many that do not have a voice - monetarily, and also literally. Several of my neighbors do not speak English, and I worry that they have not had the opportunity to fully come to terms with what will be happening here soon, or if they even know about it at all! I understand that you are not interested in studying a full re-route of I-70 that includes I-270, and I-76 (roadways that have land available to expand onto without destroying homes and businesses) at this time, but I would like to request that you do an SEIS on this option. This is the only 100% guaranteed way to re-link up Globeville and Elyria-Swansea neighborhoods with the heart of Denver. And the more information you release to the public, the better. Our neighborhoods will have more of a chance to become fully informed of a change that could greatly impact our communities. Thanks for your time, I just hope everything that is feasible will be looked over, and the best choices will be made, because it affects the whole town, but our neighborhoods most of all.

Please consider the I70 reroute along 270/76 instead. My family and I can not believe that the I70 rebuild will be cost effective or better for Denver. As a North Denver resident, I would prefer if North Denver neighborhoods could be reconnected after the separation caused by the highway. So much more positive neighborhood development could take place with a reroute. The air quality near residential areas would be greatly improved.

As a Clayton Neighborhood resident and lifelong asthma patient, I am alarmed by the lack of true consideration given to the option of re-routing I-70 to the 270 corridor. Growing up in South Denver, my family lived on the corner of Monaco Blvd and Eastman Ave, and I was subjected to pollution from living 50 feet from four lanes of traffic during the mid 1970s, when traffic was much lighter in volume. Nonetheless, at age 5, after repeated respiratory infections, I developed asthma, which continues to follow me to age 41. I know first-hand the lifelong limitations and health risks faced by persons subjected to increased particulate matter from vehicles. The current plan to conduct a big dig through the Elyria/Swansea neighborhood, and drop additional lanes of traffic into a neighborhood already contaminated from a SuperFund Cleanup is reprehensible. The neighborhoods surrounding I-70 remain physically divided from the rest of the City of Denver, and are zones of social and economic apartheid. The City and County of Denver, the State of Colorado and CDOT have a social justice responsibility to rectify what I-70 has done to those neighborhoods and those residents for the past 50 years. CDOT also has the responsibility to protect the safety, health and welfare of those living with the vicinity of any proposed alteration to I-70. The planned expansion will cause great harm to children living and going to school only feet from the proposed project, and jeopardize their lives. African American and Hispanic children suffering from asthma are twice as likely to die of the disease than are Caucasian children. Hispanic and African American families are precisely the predominant racial makeup of the residents living near I-70 and the proposed expansion. If the proposed project goes forward, the incidence of respiratory illnesses and death rates near this area will soar. The State of Colorado and CDOT could find themselves in the position of defendants in a class- action lawsuit brought by the residents living near the expansion. Unfortunately for CDOT, most of those families have been residing in the same houses for 50+ years. Finding negligence and guilt for causing these new disease rates will be a cake walk for any jury, since those illnesses can be easily compared to the past fifty years of statistical data. This is a scenario which does not need to happen. By re-routing I-70 to the 270 corridor, we can reconnect those neighborhoods in their entirety, prevent loss of life and respiratory illnesses, and do it all for 25% of the cost of the proposed I-70 expansion/big dig. I strongly disagree with the proposed plan to expand I-70 in its current location, and give full support to re-routing the highway along the 270 corridor, where the numbers of Colorado residents impacted will be far fewer.

Dear CDOT planners and policy makers, As a citizen of Denver and a homeowner who lives next to I-70, I find your lack of judgement to be suspect. Why on earth would you not properly consider the reroute of I-70 through the city to I-270 and I-76 and get it out of the city? It is your job to evaluate all possible routes to find the best one for the future of the Denver and the surrounding areas. My guess is, as you have always done, will be to dismiss my comment because I live near the Interstate. Your pre-canned response of "Not in my backyard" comments are so infuriating and lazy. Such a response points to your inability to fulfill your job. You should in fact listen to people who live near the Interstate as we are constantly reminded what a polluted, noisy, poorly managed Interstate that was created in the 60s. Your job is one of the most important in the state as you are making decisions that will affect millions and generations to come. If you move the Interstate out of the city and along I-270 to I-76, you will be regarded as a hero. If you continue the injustice of your current trench plan, you will continue the poor judgement of the corrupt Interstate planners of the 60s. Why do I make such a strong claim? If you look back at the history of the current placement of I-70, the Interstate planners were corrupt and in the pocket of business interests at the time. They had the opportunity to route the Interstate around the city, just like the train rails had done and the light rail is doing today. But because having a Interstate next to land owned by business was considered more important than the neighborhoods that were cut apart and polluted by the Interstate, we have I-70 where it lays today. Case in point, when A. Alfred Taubman paid the Interstate planners to place the Interstate next to his planned Lakeside mall. The highway had to do an S-Curve around Berkley lake, making it a very dangerous stretch of hi-way. Again, the business interests were put ahead of the safety of citizens. The Lakeside mall is gone but the deadly Interstate remains. Fix the poor discussions of your predecessors and make a safe, modern Intestates that goes around the neighborhoods, not through them. The I-76 and I-270 re-route option has a lot of positives and should be considered a viable alternative to the trench. The re-route option will remove the "death bend" around berkley lake. It will stimulate the neighborhoods destroyed by the Interstate in the first place. It will create new business opportunities along the I-76 I-270 corridor. And, if independent estimates are correct, it will cost much less then the current plan. Please do your job and actually consider possible alternatives. Be responsible and do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Let's have a real discussion on the alternatives to the trench. One that takes into account the EIS, costs, and impact to the city. A concerned citizen

I have lived in North Denver for 30 years. My son lived in the Elyria-Swansea neighborhood for 10 years so I'm familiar with some of the areas affected by I-70. I think that re-traumatizing the same neighborhood and taking a step away from environmentally sound practices are huge mistakes for CDOT and Denver to make. I have travelled through cities that route traffic around downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. Their neighborhood friendly planning puts people first. Don't tear down more of what is left of Elyria-Swansea, making property owners, small businesses and ordinary citizens less able to enjoy a reasonable quality of life. Highways never belong in neighborhoods. It's time to plan for a healthy future. Choose the alternative that makes sense by rerouting I-70 onto 76 and 270. Brighton Boulevard could become the entryway into downtown Denver from the North. It makes more sense.

The more I read about this proposed I-70 expansion the more concerned I become. Construction of the proposed plan will be complicated; it will almost certainly exceed already expensive projections. I understand that the re-route would only cost about half as much while addressing I-70 congestion issues on BOTH sides of I-25, not just the east side. And why do we want to continue to dump even more pollution into neighborhoods when there is an alternate route already available that could have far less impact? Who really stands to benefit here? And who's driving this agenda?

I lived in Houston when Hwy 59 was moved below grade. While it does look better from several blocks away, it did absolutely nothing to reconnect the neighborhoods on either side of the highway. I-70 should be rerouted onto I-76 to truly allow these neighborhoods to thrive.

Please reconsider. The best plan is to take I-70 north of the city to 270. Keeping all of that traffic in the city is polluting and noisy. The underground solution is fraught with problems, especially in bad weather. Rescue operations will be a nightmare. Do not build the below grade option.

I'm happy with the current below grade plan but I do have some concerns. The Corp of Engineers revised their flood risk not too long ago and I'm concerned that the flood design is only for a 100 year flood. I'm also concerned that just adding two lanes is insufficient. The traffic is unimaginable from Colorado Boulevard to the Mouse Trap and I can only believe that drivers are avoiding the area and will change their driving habits as soon as the road is fixed.  
Thanks

I highly encourage the CDOT plan for I-70 and hope the re-route option to I-270/I-76 is tabled for GOOD. The Unite North Metro Denver is sadly mistaken in their belief that the re-route option is better. I ask, better for whom? For those of us who cannot attend meetings, please let our voices be heard as loudly as those who can attend the meetings.  
Thank you.

I do not support re-building I-70 East below grade, with a park on top. Remember the big dig? Big expense, limited value. Keep it simple. Rerouting north to I-76 would be good. Consider a free route north, or a toll road on I-70 to discourage non-local drivers from taking I-70.

I believe the preliminarily-identified preferred alternative should be reconsidered. I have reviewed the alternatives and several dozen comparable projects as part of my job.  
First, the alternative does not "stitch" the neighborhoods back together; we only need to visit I-25 as it runs through Wash Park to see that neighborhoods on either side of this sunken freeway are not "stitched together."  
Second, creating a park over a freeway is not a solution that fixes the problem of disconnected neighborhoods. I have also read that this solution serves to concentrate particulates from fast-moving (and idling) traffic below and is potentially deleterious to the health of park users.  
Third, this is not a 21st century solution. Taxpayers are spending billions of dollars to build out our transit system. They are not interested in building more roads. We know that expanding vehicle lanes does not reduce traffic. With climate change and global warming becoming greater concerns, it is fundamentally irresponsible to increase the number of vehicle lanes.  
Fourth, in order to attract new residents to the area, and benefit existing residents, we need to show that we are a progressive, forward-thinking, innovative region. The preferred alternative is not one that is championed by urban leaders.  
There are dozens of reasons why this solution does not work. Please reconsider the alternative of rerouting traffic up north. It just makes sense. I hope CDOT will be on the right side of history here.

I firmly believe there is a better alternative to this proposed construction nightmare on i70. My home is within one mile of i70. The alternative of using interstate 76 should be looked at. The lower impact on the environment, neighborhoods and lower cost are reasons enough. Dallas, Texas is still working through a similar project cutting through the main artery in that city. Traffic can be at a stand still on this interstate stopping people from taking trips to get business done or spending money. This project has been ten years of non stop construction and I'm worried that Denver will be the same. The cost is unknown, but what is known is the negative impact on several key attractions to Denver's growing city. Getting to and from the airport is a key part of businesses bringing conventions to town. This is also a key element of many young professionals coming to Denver. This would be much harder with unpredictable construction for several years. Splitting neighborhoods in half and lowering property values is bad enough. The i70 tunnel near Idaho Springs had to recently be widened to accommodate cars constantly slamming on their brakes just because a tunnel was coming up. The same effect would happen here, not to mention unpredictable ice build up at the entrance of a major tunnel like this. These foreseen problems make it silly to not fully study the alternative use of i76.

The cost of the covered lanes is outrageous. How many bridges can we rehab for that kind of money! Go back and start over if this is your best idea.

I recall the days of the long tunnel under the runways at Stapleton. That tunnel caused many, many accidents when drivers instinctively slowed and a chain-reaction of rear end collisions resulted. So you you propose to recreate this same hazard by burying i70. This is especially a factor a dusk and dawn, when the highway is aligned with the sun and lighting levels suddenly change for drivers. Please consider the safety issue. If it does get buried, maybe some kind of transition mechanism that provides a way for drivers to adapt to the sudden new environment.

As a frequent commuter on I 70, I completely support the proposed below grade proposal for I 70. The 76/270 bypass would be a disaster

I think the current Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative looks great and should be considered the primarily proposal moving forward. People who propose rerouting I70 along the 270-76 corridor do not speak for me. I think rerouting alone that corridor will horrible idea. I really like the idea of a partial cover for the below grade highway. That is a great way to link the elementary school with the surrounding community.

Dear CDOT,

I have really been trying to figure out how I feel about this plan. After a lot of research, It seems like it's just not a good solution for many reasons. Sorry for the long post but it's not a simple problem or simple solution.

When I look at the pros and cons, I'd rather spend a few more minutes in traffic than support this CDOT expansion plan.

1. Traffic shouldn't be a commodity. I'm strongly opposed to the toll lanes being operated by private companies. These private operator partners answer to investors. State government answers to taxpayers. The upfront payments that states receive are worth far less than the value of future toll revenue from the road..that's how they make money. Indiana and Chicago found that private investors would recoup their investments in less than 20 years but the contracts are for 75 and 99 years. There is no reason the state can't operate the toll road to raise the money to build a better solution. States lose control over many transportation issues. We have not seen any details of the proposed contracts or agreements. Toll road investors want assurances that traffic levels will meet or exceed predictions. Some privatization contracts limit states' ability to improve or expand nearby roads and facilities. These corporations want congestion, so the toll lanes become more attractive. For example, Indiana is prevented from building a highway (or expanding a current highway to Interstate standards) within 10 miles or a private operated toll lane road for at least 55 years without providing compensation to the toll road operator for lost revenue. One state had to reimburse the private operator half a million dollars for waiving toll collections to assist in evacuations from flooding. Some contracts require adjacent municipalities to add stop lights and reduce speed limits on local roads as a way to reduce potential competition and have more people use the toll lanes. Some of these private/public contracts require the state to pay investors compensation for reduced toll revenue when the state performs construction, such as adding an exit or building a mass transit line. Who knows what the city will need or what new transportation options will be available in the next 30, 50 , or 90 years.

2. Bigger highways actually tend to make traffic worse. The current plan, is a 20th century solution. The concept of "Induced Demand" negates the value of wider highways. The concept is pretty simple: Basically the more you have, the more you use it. A 10 year study showed if a city increased road capacity by 10 percent the amount of driving in that city went up by 10 percent--even if the population stayed the same or even decreased. Make it easier to drive more and people will. There are tons of studies proving the concept. Many cities have gotten rid of major highways and not seen an increase in traffic or gridlock. Great article: <http://gizmodo.com/6-freeway-demolitions...> Think about it, the most congested highways in America are also the biggest. The bigger they get, the more congested they get. Here are some interesting articles that give you a different perspective:

<http://www.wired.com/2014/06/wuwt-traffic...> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/dig...> There is no question the highway needs work, but smarter on and off ramps, a shoulder, HOV lane and drainage would solve a lot of the issues.

3. People are driving less It's hard to believe, but Americans are driving less. The world is changing quickly. More people are telecommuting (a trend that will grow) online shopping continues to grow, remote access to services better mass transit options the expense of car ownership is growing. Here are some really interesting facts about traffic and the decline of driving. <http://uspig.org/reports/usp/new-direct...> <http://news.medill.northwestern.edu/chic...>

4. The impact of the highway on the neighborhoods 20 businesses and 53 homes to be taken. Yes, owners are to be compensated at fair market value. But a 4 bedroom house there is about 120,000. Where will they find a home for that? While you can pontificate about not buying next to a highway, many of these homes are multi-generation occupants. Many lived there before there was a highway. They may have bought there after the highway, because they wanted to be part of the American dream and it was the only place they could afford to buy. The neighborhoods impacted currently suffer from more health problems than any other neighborhood in the city of Denver due to the pollution. We want to add to this? This a population that has few options. Most will never qualify for a mortgage with the new, stricter lending rules. The current viaduct is 177 feet wide. CDOT proposes to expand the highway almost 300' as it travels through these neighborhoods and it will be within 65' of an elementary school. Do you want your kids playing 65' from highway? The health impacts of spending that much time near a highway are none debatable.

<http://www.ehjournal.net/content/6/1/23>

Again, these are people with few options. Many are factory workers and service staff. They have to be at work at 5 a.m. or when their shift starts and can't take their kids to different schools or pick them up. This is not to incite or defend or persuade. It seems to me that there are still lots of options that have not been explored. I just find once you get past all the politics and ideology, the only upside to this plan is the possibility of cutting a few minutes off my drive . The downside is tremendous on many levels and just doesn't make sense to me.

( By the way, I have taken I70 to work for the last 15 years so I get the frustration )

Our preference is the Preferred Alternative (Partial Cover Lower Alternative) for the I-70 East expansion.

As a long-time northeast Denver resident, I want to go on record supporting your plans to drop portions of I-70 below grade. This is the clearly the superior alternative, despite a limited number of apparently vocal opponents.

We need to understand the problems that need to be solved in the short term and long term regarding the NE Denver portion of I-70. The expanding number of lanes is clearly a necessity. However, there are several issues with the proposed solution that don't consider the long term needs of the adjacent neighborhoods and the city at large. Further, we have an opportunity to think of the whole corridor from Quebec to Brighton Blvd as a huge area to improve many ills including a horrible first impression by guests travelling to the city from DIA, a marginalization of flanking neighborhoods including Globeville, Swansea, Park Hill and the light commercial areas as well. If we considered an alternative of rerouting I-70 along I-270 and I-76 (or 56th) those options would improve several arteries and corridors at the same time. First, I-270 is in poor shape and with the reroute there could be real money infused to improve that artery. Second, the remaining I-70 corridor could be transformed to a blvd similar to Speer, MLK, etc. which will still handle fairly large vehicular volumes while not totally cutting off neighborhoods. I-70 also is so noisy and smelly that most neighborhood development is stifled. Third, this new blvd could tie into Brighton Blvd as a new entrance into the heart of the city. Lastly, this allows for a huge transformation for the whole NE Denver corridor in a more substantial way similar to the development that is occurring in Rino, Lohi and other formerly more industrial areas. The costs associated with one of these is admittedly greater, but not unreasonably and with a much greater return. Ultimately, it would create more opportunity for much larger portions of NE Denver to truly thrive for the next chapter in Denver's success.

CDOT needs to explore all options before changing the width of I-70-- they need to do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. How is it possible these options were not already studied, considering the astronomical amount of money that will be spent on this project? On the surface, the lack of diligence in the original EIS reeks of cronyism or gross oversight. I don't believe either of those are actually the way CDOT operates and I think this new study can help repair CDOT's tarnished reputation. Do the study and make the decision based on what is best for the communities impacted, not what's convenient for CDOT and its vendors. Thank you for taking my opinion into consideration. Very much looking forward to the results of the new SEIS. Sincerely, Small Business Owner and Resident in Berkeley

I live on the 4600 block of Vine street. Many of the houses on my block will be demolished if the expansion goes forward. I will live one hundred yards closer to I-70 traffic. Every time I see this project referred to as "covered" or it is mentioned that it will unite the neighborhood it makes me livid. C-Dot is only "covering" a very small portion of the highway and we in Swansea will now be further cut off from Denver by the additional of toll lanes which many in the neighborhood can't afford. This is a terrible idea. Progressive thinking would suggest we need to move away from sprawl and long commutes and cities sliced and diced by massive highways. Adding more lanes will just lead to more traffic. I could more easily accept what this project will do to me personally living within spitting distance if the highway were expanding for public transit or for dedicated bus lanes, but the fact that it is for more car traffic (and for those who have money) makes me want to cry. All of I-70 thru traffic should reroute north. We will have to live with this plan for a very long time. Urban centers are booming and growing all over the country as young people flock back to urban areas. These neighborhoods are very close to central Denver and could flourish given the chance. Instead we will be further cut off and diminished. Thanks CDOT.

I am commenting about the I-70 expansion. I, as well as everyone I have spoken to about the subject, am completely against this expansion. The research has not been done as to alternatives and the effects have not been honestly discussed. First of all, this expansion has the potential to ruin the lives of many people who don't even have any idea that this is coming. People who buy houses next to the freeway don't do this because it is their ideal location, they do this because they have no other financially viable option. Looking at the history of expansions such as these, the families will not receive the full amount for their houses. We are also not talking about families with plenty in their savings to start over. Buying a new home costs a lot of money beyond the new mortgage and they simply do not have that. The worst part is that these families have no idea that it is coming, and there has been no effort to inform them. I attended a town hall meeting in one of the neighborhoods and the attendance was very small. Even if they heard and tried to inform themselves, unless they are literate in English, which many are not, there is very little information on the CDOT website. 90% of the "Spanish" webpage is in English! Is this a joke!!! Another effect that has not been addressed is the environmental impact. There is plenty of research as to the health concerns of living near a freeway and with the expansion these will only get worse. There are alternatives! For example, rerouting I-70 through industrial neighborhoods via I-76 and I-270. The research done into the viability of this option are limited to none. It is irresponsible and negligible to move forward with the idea that is cheaper and easier in the moment. Someone needs to look to the future. What is the plan after the expanded roads are big enough to hold traffic? Is the plan to just take out another block? Because I don't think anyone would argue traffic will lessen in the next 50 years. CDOT needs to be held accountable for their actions! Your job is to make improvements in the best interests of the citizens of Colorado and in pushing forward with the expansion of I-70 you are simply not.

As a long time resident living just off I-70, I have often thought about how quiet our neighborhood would be without I-70. I would very much appreciate serious consideration of combining I-70 with I-76 (reroute) and converting I-70 into a boulevard. Wouldn't that be beautiful?

You need to do a SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76!

After reading various sections of your study I feel obligated to comment. I am a taxpayer and regularly use the relevant sections of I-70. I also work for an engineering and construction company with significant infrastructure experience. With this background I feel responsible to request you look at discontinuing this alternative as I believe 1) the cost estimated is too high and value low, 2) impact on neighborhoods and families massively detrimental, and 3) environmental risks high. I believe you will significantly overrun on cost for this project as presented and again the return will be too low. I implore you to consider the proposed I-76 reroute that may have lower costs and clearly more value to improving the community. Thank you for your fair consideration

I'm alarmed at the possibilities an expanded I-70 will bring to the Globeville, Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods. These neighborhoods have already been compromised by a separation from the rest of Denver's revitalized Highlands and RiNo neighborhoods, and will be further ruined by this new plan. Demand for real estate development in the city makes these areas an opportunity to reclaim these neighborhoods - but will not continue to do so if I-70 is widened. This is our opportunity to make it right! And what about west of I-25? How is it that CDOT expects to make a gigantic expansion to I-70 east of I-25 and no expansion west of I-25 without creating a horrible bottleneck at I-25 which defeats the desired benefits? CDOT suggests that 50% of the traffic on I-70 westbound gets off onto I-25 - which I find hard to believe. In their calculations, CDOT fails to account for any I-25 traffic that gets onto I-70. As a resident of the area, I've experienced this bottleneck on a regular basis, when I-70 west of I-25 is often backed-up. So, is the expansion of I-70 west of I-25 next? How many homes will that one take? Don't ruin my neighborhood like what's happened east of I-25! Instead, I am extremely supportive of the plan to re-route I-70 along the existing I-270 and I-76 route. Adams County has a tremendous economic development opportunity with a re-route onto I-270 and I-76. As of now, most of those areas are un-developed, under-developed or blighted. Light rail is being developed in the area and a rerouted I-70 would further create a smart transportation corridor. Please CDOT, do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76!

This information includes all school children and adults in the five mile radius around Purina Corporation @ I-70 & York. In reference to all information and material that has been distributed through-out the past 10 1/2 years, a final highway solution is becoming available. My concern and as many other residents understand the inevitable situation needed for I-70s expansion. We all know that with more traffic emission will rise. So now is the right time to register discourses pertaining to Purina's unethical obnoxious odor at the beginning of I-70s meetings a representative for the Purina Corporation (Mr. Lewis) stated the company would add filters to these stacks, in exchange for not moving the Highway south. Now is the perfect time to apply pressure to this corporation for its unethical odor standards many more out of state people will pass through this new reconstructed Highway and smell these obnoxious odors. Denver has become a beautiful metropolis and what a disgrace to infringe this awful smell to all our new visitors. Counsel lady Judy Montero of district #9 said that I could not do anything about this issue because of Purina's strong political pull, ??? Texas \$18 million yearly. Maybe a lawful citizen petition would result for better air quality surrounding the five mile radius. As for now young and old will continue to breathe this discouragement of air quality, depending on which way the wind is blowing. With "condemnation," hope the wind blows your way today. This odor causes property "devaluation" to the radius. - please respond -

CDOT, The further construction of I-70 is about half right for the good flow of traffic. East bound I-70 from I-25 to Tower Rd. should keep traffic flowing moderately well. West bound I-70 from Tower Rd to I-25 is a whole different story. I can imagine it being backed up to Tower Rd. There is traffic congestion at I-70 and I-25 now with 3 lanes of west bound I-70 traffic. One cannot widen I-25 between 38th and I-70. It is at its widest point now. West bound I-70 west of I-25 and north bound I-25 north of I-70 cannot handle the traffic at rush hour either. Lets eliminate some traffic entering into that interchange. It is not going to get any better. Lets remove the west bound lanes of I-70 between Colorado Blvd. and Brighton Blvd. and re-route that traffic lessening all that traffic entering the I-25/I-70 interchange. CDOT is building a hi-way that is not fully functional. We can do better. As it is designed now, it is going to create extra pollution, more congestion, unhappy residents, additional costs to build and further costs to correct the problems this I-70 is creating. Build it right the first time around. Take an aerial photo of the mousetrap area and beyond during rush hours in the morning and in late afternoon on a working week day so we all can see and know there is traffic congestion. And explain how this new I-70 west bound five lane is going to alleviate traffic congestion.

Information, air, pictures of before and after. (Wonderfull plan)

Dear Sirs, To widen the I-70 wound across North Denver and dig it in would cost too much in every way I can imagine. It is a mistake based on outmoded models of traffic management. Denver needs this section of highway less and less as traffic declines. I think making it bigger will only make it worse. Even with the bandage across part of it, the new I-70 East would wipe out more land around it and would further isolate and insult the people living north of it. They deserve better, and Denver can do better than to chase a mistake like this. Denver has matured greatly since the 1970s, when I and the rest of the construction industry had to scramble, trying to keep up with each boom and bust. We must continue to show we know how to plan for a world different than today's. San Francisco has done well without the Embarcadero; other cities are removing their highways and benefiting from it. Denver should not be gouging its outmoded highway wider and deeper. Ever since I could use I-76 and I-270, I have preferred that route to slogging through North Denver on I-70. Diverting I-70 past the city makes more sense. It would be far less expensive and disruptive, and it would allow Denver to continue developing and changing.

Dear Director Hunt: This SDEIS is fatally flawed and should not be constructed...ever. The I-70 Viaduct through Denver must be replaced. The design solution to this major transportation infrastructure problem must be cause in the improvement of traffic flow and capacity. It can bring improvements to the built environment; reduce natural impacts, and preserve or improve the overall quality of life in the areas of towns currently bisected by Interstate Highway 70. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impacts Study (SDEIS) for the "trench" has significant deficiencies. This current SDEIS has the features or deficiencies as follows: The SDEIS has little mention of an air quality component for the project. There is another published study in this area of Denver includes health impacts of I-70 to be significantly detrimental to the neighboring citizens. The Findings of the existing report of this area concludes that it is a fatal flaw to place a 10-lane road here. The \$1.8 Billion Dollar funding is not explained in the SDEIS except for the use of 50% of the State bridge maintenance revenues for many years to come. This is unacceptable. There is a "blank" green area that is roughly 800 foot long by 350 foot wide "park". It is located directly above the 10 Lane wide, 200,000 plus vehicle traffic per day area; two other smaller green areas lay amidst very high background noise and exhaust filled areas knowing only the single "park" is actually included in the scope of work. Imagine the high fences at that place. The destruction of more than 57 dwelling units and 20 businesses is unacceptable. Moving roughly 1,000,000,000 cubic feet of earth to build this design is unacceptable. Where does that material go? Has it all been tested for existing pollutants? Is that cost in the scope of work? How much traffic away from the work zone created? The SDEIS does not include a detailed solution to alleviate the major East West traffic construction detours. Perhaps Highway 270 and 76 could work as the 5-Year detour. Why are you endorsing this solution while a healthier, more pragmatic, prudent, and most probably, almost certain, more environmentally friendly I-70 Re-Route using Highways 270/76 could be possible and more regionally effective. The 270/76 Solution can be built using only existing right-of-ways while I-70 is still operational. With the 270/76 Re-Route Solution, there is opportunity for the removal of the existing I-70 viaduct and redeveloping 80 plus acres of that land area to create neighborhood amenities such as parks, new housing, new businesses, improved property values, and a new, at grade, six lane grand Boulevard leading into Denver.

As a native of Denver and an descendent of families that lived in the Globeville/Swansea neighborhoods, I am hoping than an alternative to creating a bigger divide through North Denver can be found. I have seen in other cities, like Boston and San Francisco, where highways that were erected in the 50's and were ill-planned devastated neighborhoods and decimated property values. Now that those eyesores are gone, the waterfront in SF and Boston are places people visit again. I can envision such a thing along Berkeley and Rocky Mountain Lakes. Now is Denver's chance to reunite the neighborhoods that were severed from the city and undo the damage that rushed-to-build highway systems have wrought. Widening I-70 is a poor plan. Traffic through our city increases every year and in 20-30 years will we need to widen I-70 again? Ot to mention the horrible bottleneck that will occur at the I-25 inter-change. Rerouting I-70 north along I-76 makes sense, not only for Denver, but for our future development. This is our opportunity to beautify north Denver, undo the mistake of the past and bring Denver together again.

We live in Park Hill and we are adamantly opposed to CDOT's plans to expand I70 with toll lanes and to bury a portion of the mega highway in a tunnel. We are from LA. We moved to Denver to escape LA traffic and gridlock. We oppose the expansion: 1. You will further pollute the air in my neighborhood when you dig up the polluted ground for the tunnel. 2. Almost every enlightened city planner ( except ours, of course) has discovered that adding lanes to highways just brings in more cars. We need a transportation plan for the future , not your "grandfather's plan" to just bring in more cars. 3. Truck traffic on I70 need to be rerouted away from the major population areas to avoid the health problems that they cause from their pollution to say nothing about their noise. 4. Privatizing public assets is not a good plan. You can't make a profit off of everything. There is plenty of money in CO to have the roads that we deserve, not the current third world status of many of our roads. When asked, the voters give. Don't give away our precious resources to Goldman Sachs and your corporate buddies ( in secret meetings). We need to tax the billionaires and corporations who want to do business in our great state, not be held hostage and give them sweetheart tax deals. Have you been watching The Roosevelts on TV?? Well, we are in the same situation today as we were then. We need real leadership not cronyism and corruption. 5. the fumes billowing up out of the tunnel will be horrendous. 6. the "lap pool " that will be created in the tunnel will be terrible. 7. Crime in tunnels like the one you are proposing soars in other cities. You know all of the arguments against the expansion of I70. Start thinking outside of the box. think and plan like the Native Americans do, , for seven generations out. Don't create this expensive boondoggle. BTW I lived in one of Brad Buchanan's "well planned" buildings, 2001 Lincoln. Nobody in the building could drink the water because it exceeded all EPA standards for heavy metals. The building had to deliver bottled water and we had to bathe in rusty , brown water. All because he and his partners got a great deal on some galvanized pipes from India. That's right, every where that you could look you saw copper but the building leaked like a sieve because the pipes had holes in them. Leaks, contaminated water..all in a "new" building. No wonder that Brad can not practice architecture anymore ( i've been told) becasue he can't get insurance. too many bad projects. You really stuck it to the citizens with the privatization of the Boulder turnpike. 50 years? That was a terrible price to pay to avoid paying your workers decent wages with decent benefits. Government is supposed to be creating jobs not sending people to the hell of minimum wage labor with no future . The USA is fast becoming a third world country. the numbers point in that direction. Roads for the rich will create anger and animosity on the part of the downtrodden. I wish i could be alive for the next 50 years to watch this one play out.

Why would we want to increase pollution even further in the EPA impact zone of I-70 from Harlan to Central Park Blvd. when there are 11 schools within that zone? This project will consume an incredible amount of money. Why aren't more cost effective alternatives being considered? Why was the full re-route that is on both I-270 & I-76 not studied as a part of this SEIS? It would be wonderful if a re-route meant our neighborhoods would be more geographically united and environmentally better off. That is a win for all homeowners and families in the "EPA impact zone."

Hello. I have read the article, "Options for I-70 Vetted," on Page 5A of the Denver Post of October 7 2014. I have also read the excellent pro and con arguments in the current issue of the Greater Park Hill News, October 2014. The pro side was written by Brad Buchanan, and the opposition was written by Denver Auditor Dennis Gallagher. For the reasons provided by Auditor Gallagher, I am opposed to the CDOT proposal. Other alternatives are available, such as the proposals made by Frank Sullivan and Thad Taxa. Everyone agrees that the viaduct must be replaced as it is dangerous because of its age and heavy usage. The plan proposed by Mr. Buchanan and CDOT is extremely costly, and would take years to complete, siphoning off badly needed improvements in roads and highways elsewhere in the state. Thank you

I'm the owner of a real estate brokerage in Northwest Denver, and am alarmed at the possibilities an expanded I-70 will bring to the Globeville, Elyria & Swansea neighborhoods. These neighborhoods, have already been compromised by the a separation from the rest of Denver's revitalized Highlands and RiNo neighborhoods, will be further ruined by this new plan. Home values in those neighborhoods have barely-increased in the past 15-20 years. Every other neighborhood that's within four miles of the urban core is worth two, three or four times as much as it was in the same period. A Demand for real estate development in the city makes these areas an opportunity to reclaim these neighborhoods - but will not continue to do if it is widened. There is an opportunity to make it right! And what about west of I-25? How is it that CDOT expects to make a gigantic expansion to I-70 east of I-25 and no expansion west of I-25 without creating a horrible bottleneck at I-25 which defeats the desired benefits? CDOT suggests that 50% of the traffic on I-70 westbound gets off onto I-25 - which I find hard to believe. In their calculations, CDOT fails to account for any I-25 traffic that gets onto I-70. As a resident of the area, I've experienced this bottleneck on a regular basis, when I-70 west of I-25 is often backed-up. So, is the expansion of I-70 west of I-25 next? How many homes will that one take? Don't ruin my neighborhood like what's happened east of I-25! Instead, I would be supportive of the plan to re-route I-70 along the existing I-270 & I-76 route. Adams County has a tremendous economic development opportunity with a re-route onto I-270 & I-76. As of now, most of those areas are un-developed, under-developed or blighted. Light rail is being developed in the area and a rerouted I-70 would further create a smart transportation corridor. Please CDOT, do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76!

Why do you say you have contact with the community? You are callous and indifferent to residents concerns and only have community meetings to satisfy federal requirement. Nobody attends your meeting because we know they are useless. I asked a very specific question and five "concerned" representative took my email address and said they would get back to me. Haven't heard a thing. That means your proposed plan WILL fail because it is the people that live in the area that are the best predictors of failure. I'll bet 50 years ago people told you about problems with the overpass--did you listen? Why don't you self-involved elitist come out of your lofty meeting room and talk to your front line employees and those gross people in those poor neighborhood that NOBODY in power considers. I don't know why I bother, this email will go to the delete bin with all the rest.

I would like to know the potential impacts to property owners and boundaries of homes effeced.

Hello I-70 East Project,

I hope this email finds you well. I am a Denver resident and have a question about your Air Quality Technical Report and was hoping someone in your office might be able to help.

I am interested in the PM 2.5 and PM 10 levels in the report. Do you have the microgram/cubicmeter/day readings for PM 2.5? I was only able to find PM10 levels in that measurement.

You also have great Forecasted PM10 levels in your hotspot areas. Table 19,20 & 21 in the Air Quality report are great. Do you have forecasted PM2.5 levels in those areas? Or any similar tables that show the PM2.5 readings?

Thank you!

Oct. 9th, 2014 I vehemently oppose this project. There are 3 weeks left during the comment period and more than half of CDOT's Spanish version website is in English, including, but not limited to how the project will be funded and upcoming public hearings. I've sent more examples to CDOT employees. I also have a letter from Kirk Webb refusing to have the DSEIS translated into Spanish. This is completely negligent considering the overwhelming number of only Spanish speakers in Globeville, Swansea, and Elyria. Please extend the comment period or halt this project on grounds that you haven't informed the community. Considering the impact on the livelihood and well-being of the community, those are the only moral options. Thank you.

This is a ridiculous idea. Digging a hole for a highway does not make financial or environmental sense. ICE will build up in the dark tunnel you've created. Highly toxic chemicals will be released into the air. This is not supported by the neighborhood that has to deal with this crazy scheme. REROUTE I-70. We don't want this in our hood.

I cannot believe that Colorado, a state that believes they are forward-thinking, is pushing to expand lanes on this highway. And at such a great cost to the neighborhood, homes, and the elementary school situated there. Please go back to the drawing board. Let's remove I-70 from our neighborhood and put more important community-building options there. REROUTE I-70. Do not put it underground.

Only travelers and those operating in a not-for-hire capacity should be allowed to use the elevated structure. Force "drivers" "teamsters" and commercial road hogs to go around the road and encourage them to do so at appropriate times. The tragedy of the commons is tragic only due to the attempt to make a good free. A highly variable fee for use on commercial vehicles would be a great start. Personal economic planning beats government planning by factors unimaginable by "planners" (spelled fucktard). Use economics to solve this one, fellows.

CDOT should not proceed with this project because "all reasonable opportunities to participate" were not given to the communities of Globeville, Swansea, and Elyria according to the policy of CDOT. With the amount of Spanish speakers in those neighborhoods, CDOT should have made every effort to communicate the details of this project in Spanish. As of today, with less than three weeks until the comment deadline, more than half of the Spanish version of this project's website is in English. Here is one of so many examples: Evaluacion y Comentario del Publico - Se ha Ampliado el Periodo de Comentarios (Comments must be received by 31 de Octubre del 2014) Extended to 31 de Octubre Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) Periodo de Evaluacion y Comentario del Publico Copies of the Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) are available online, at several viewing locations, including at CDOT offices, and at the I-70 East Project Office. Public Hearings will be conducted to present the findings of the study and to obtain input from the community. Your comments are an important aid in making the best decision for transportation improvements in the corridor. They will be addressed in the Final EIS and play an important role in determining the preferred alternative. Please use the Comment Form to submit your comments or use the Printable Form and mail them to the address listed below. Comments can also be submitted by e-mail to [contactus@i-70east.com](mailto:contactus@i-70east.com) or submitted at the Audiencias Publicas. Having only the title and a couple words in Spanish for so many sections makes it seem that CDOT is attempting to hide such deception. I have emailed Kirk Webb addressing this issue and have sent him the majority of these cases of sloppiness or deception, and have not received a response. I have a letter from Kirk Webb refusing to have the SDEIS fully translated into Spanish and refusing to extend the deadline. In this letter, he cites the ways that CDOT tried to half heartedly make the public aware. It is laughable and I will make this matter known to advocacy groups and attorneys. I emphasize that FHWA and CDOT policy to "provide citizens with limited English proficiency all reasonable opportunities to participate" in your projects was NOT followed!!! Please contact me if you need to see a copy of any letter or examples of deception from the CDOT website. Thank you.



In a letter I have from CDOT's Kirk Webb, he states: Executive Order (13166) challenges federal agencies to "implement a system by which (limited English-proficient or "LEP") persons can meaningfully access services consistent with, and without unduly burdening, the fundamental mission of the agency." To show that CDOT has complied, he states that, "All advertisements for comment periods, public hearings, regular public meetings, website materials, etc...are in both English and Spanish." Below are some examples from the Spanish version of CDOT's website failing to comply with EO13166. In his letter, Mr. Webb refuses to have the SDEIS fully translated to Spanish or have the comment period extended. I have contacted Mr. Webb alerting him to these issues and have not received a response. This is unacceptable and I have contacted advocacy groups and attorneys if this project should continue. Supplemental Draft EIS Released 29 de Agosto del 2014 I-70 East Supplemental Draft EIS is available for public review and comment CDOT encourages you to comment from 29 de Agosto 31 de Octubre del 2014. CDOT is encouraging the public to comment on the I-70 East Supplemental Draft EIS that evaluates transportation alternatives to improve safety, access and mobility while addressing congestion in one of the state's most heavily traveled corridors, I-70 from I-25 to Tower Road. The Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) is a report that includes a detailed analysis of the social, environmental, and economic effects of the project alternatives as required by the federal government according to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The 2008 Draft EIS alternatives were modified and a new alternative option was developed that better met the project's purpose, need, goals, and objectives and satisfied the public's and agencies' expectations. Due to these changes and further developments on the project, the Supplemental Draft EIS identifies environmental impacts not previously identified. The I-70 East Supplemental Draft EIS is available for public comment starting 29 de Agosto del 2014. The public comment period will end on 31 de Octubre del 2014. back to top (arrow up) volver arriba Evaluacin y Comentario del Publico - Se ha Ampliado el Periodo de Comentarios (Comments must be received by 31 de Octubre del 2014) Extended to 31 de Octubre Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) Periodo de Evaluacin y Comentario del Publico Copies of the Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) are available online, at several viewing locations, including at CDOT offices, and at the I-70 East Project Office. Public Hearings will be conducted to present the findings of the study and to obtain input from the community. Your comments are an important aid in making the best decision for transportation improvements in the corridor. They will be addressed in the Final EIS and play an important role in determining the preferred alternative. Please use the Comment Form to submit your comments or use the Printable Form and mail them to the address listed below. Comments can also be submitted by e-mail to [contactus@i-70east.com](mailto:contactus@i-70east.com) or submitted at the Audiencias Publicas. I-70 East Project Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222 Preliminary Identified Preferred Alternative Visualization & Animation Visualice la Alternativa de Paso a Desnivel Parcialmente Cubierto explore la Alternativa de Paso a Desnivel Parcialmente Cubierto en video animado 3d The Partial Cover Lowered Alternative is the Preliminary Identified Preferred Alternative for the I-70 East EIS project. This Alternative adds additional lanes in each direction of the highway to provide better mobility between I-25 and Tower Road, removes the existing viaduct between Brighton Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard, rebuilds I-70 along this segment below grade on the existing alignment, and places a cover on the highway between Columbine Street and Clayton Street. Actualizacin del Proyecto Supplemental Draft EIS Released 29 de Agosto del 2014 I-70 East Supplemental Draft EIS is available for public review and comment CDOT encourages you to comment from 29 de Agosto 31 de Octubre del 2014. CDOT is encouraging the public to comment on the I-70 East Supplemental Draft EIS that evaluates transportation alternatives to improve safety, access and mobility while addressing congestion in one of the state's most heavily traveled corridors, I-70 from I-25 to Tower Road. The Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) is a report that includes a detailed analysis of the social, environmental, and economic effects of the project alternatives as required by the federal government according to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The 2008 Draft EIS alternatives were modified and a new alternative option was developed that better met the project's purpose, need, goals, and objectives and satisfied the public's and agencies' expectations. Due to these changes and further developments on the project, the Supplemental Draft EIS identifies environmental impacts not previously identified. The I-70 East Supplemental Draft EIS is available for public comment starting 29 de Agosto del 2014. The public comment period will en Evaluacin y Comentario del Publico - Se ha Ampliado el Periodo de Comentarios (Comments must be received by 31 de Octubre del 2014) Extended to 31 de Octubre Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) Periodo de Evaluacin y Comentario del Publico Copies of the Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) are available online, at several viewing locations, including at CDOT offices, and at the I-70 East Project Office. Public Hearings will be conducted to present the findings of the study and to obtain input from the community. Your comments are an important aid in making the best decision for transportation improvements in the corridor. They will be addressed in the Final EIS and play an important role in determining the preferred alternative. Please use the Comment Form to submit your comments or use the Printable Form and mail them to the address listed below. Comments can also be submitted by e-mail to [contactus@i-70east.com](mailto:contactus@i-70east.com) or submitted at the Audiencias Publicas. I-70 East Project Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222 Consultants & Contractors Consultant & Contractor Participation - meetings and completion of the EIS Process Consultants & contractors are invited to attend CDOT's Spotlight Event for Major Upcoming Projects I-70 East & C-470 October 22, 2014 CDOT Event Flyer - Spotlight Event for Major Upcoming Projects I-70 East & C-470 October 22, 2014 Come join the conversation and get an inside look at what to expect as these larger projects begin to gear up. This is an excellent opportunity to get the latest available project information and to strengthen relationships with the local business community. Click to view the event flyer [»](#) With the release of the Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) we are seeing an increase in consultant and contractor attendance at the I-70 East community meetings. Although the I-70 East Project Team is excited to see this participation, there is a growing concern that the participation of professionals at the community meetings is becoming a distraction. The intent of the community meetings is to provide information and receive focused feedback from stakeholders in the community. Again, CDOT is excited to see such interest in the project from the consultants and contractors, but would request that you schedule meetings with either of the following contacts, so the community meetings can focus on the community. Thank you for your understanding and interest in the project, please contact: Keith Stefanik [keith.stefanik@state.co.us](mailto:keith.stefanik@state.co.us) Peter Kozinski [peter.kozinski@state.co.us](mailto:peter.kozinski@state.co.us) CDOT is committed to increasing the participation and capacity of the local business community through contract opportunities, educational programs, and workforce and business development. More details to come Septiembre 30, 2014 Consultants and contractors are invited to attend CDOT's Spotlight Event for Major Upcoming Projects I-70 East and C-470 on October 22, 2014. Come join the conversation and get an inside look at what to expect as these larger projects begin to gear up. This is an excellent opportunity to get the latest available project information and to strengthen relationships with the local business community. See the Consultants & Contractors page. Augusto 29, 2014 The Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) has been released See the Project Update for more information. Read the SDEIS document online or learn where to obtain a copy: Reports. The Public Review and Comment Period begins today Comments must be received by October 14, 2014. See the Project Update for more information. Public Hearings are scheduled for September 23, 24, and 25: Meeting Notices Audiencias Publicas El 23, 24 y 25 de Septiembre del 2014 Audiencias Publicas Public hearings were conducted on September 23, 2014 in Aurora (Sable Elementary School), September 24, 2014 in Commerce City (Kearney Middle School), and September 25, 2014 in Denver (Bruce Randolph Middle School). La misma informacin estaba disponible en todas las reuniones. The hearings provided opportunities for the public to comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) for inclusion in the project's official record. Project Finance Project Finance & Procurement - how will the project be financed and built? A variety of methods can be used to finance and construct the planned improvements for I-70 East. These methods include both traditional and innovative options. CDOT decides on construction and financing methods by evaluating the following: Project goals - Project constraints such as source of funding, schedule, federal/state/local laws, third party agreements with railroads, right of way, and others - Delivery schedule (construction timing) - Complexity of the project design and construction - Level of design (at the time of the project delivery selection) - Cost - Project risks Traditional methods used by CDOT over the last decade to deliver Projects: -Design-Bid-Build: Two different teams are hired for the project based on lowest price bids. The teams are selected by CDOT from a pool of prequalified consultants and contractors. 1. A design consultant is hired to design the project and produce construction plans. 2. Following design, the plans are advertised and constructors bid their best price to build the Project. 3. The low bid contractor builds the project according to the plans. This method is reliable and everyone understands what is expected. However it is very lengthy, restrictive on innovation and costly in design and oversight. Alternative methods used by CDOT over the last decade include: -Design-Build: One contractor team (designer and contractor) is hired, under one contract, to design and build the project concurrently based on a preliminary design or concept. -Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC): Similar to Design Bid Build but the designer and contractor are hired separately. 1. A design consultant is hired to design the project. 2. Construction contractor is hired at the same time to provide constructability input to the design consultant and develops a "guaranteed maximum price" to build the project. 3. If CDOT agrees with the maximum price the contractor builds the Project These methods provide the opportunity for a larger project for a fixed amount of money, innovative design partnerships between the contractor and CDOT, and allows for potential schedule improvements. Overall delivery is quickest with these methods. This CM/GC provides the opportunity for the contractor to influence the design and match their skills and resources to the Project. Overall delivery time is in-between Design-Bid-Build and Design-Build. Innovative Finance and Construction Methods: The Colorado High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE)

The Colorado Transportation Commission has asked the High Performance Transportation enterprise (HPTE) to explore financial options for the I-70 East project. For more information on the HPTE, visit [www.ColoradoHPTE.com](http://www.ColoradoHPTE.com). Comment Form I-70 East Supplemental Draft EIS Released for Public Comment The Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) has been released and is now available for public comment and review until 31 de Octubre del 2014. The Supplemental Draft EIS is available online: Reports Comments must be received by 31 de Octubre del 2014. Your comments are an important aid in making the best decision for transportation improvements in the corridor. They will be addressed in the Final EIS and play an important role in determining the preferred alternative. Please use the comment form to the right to submit your comments or use the printable form and mail them to the address listed below: SDEIS Public Comment Form - click for Printable FormClick to download: Printable Comment Form delivery selection) -Cost -Project risks Traditional methods used by CDOT over the last decade to deliver Projects: -Design-Bid-Build: Two different teams are hired for the project based on lowest price bids. The teams are selected by CDOT from a pool of prequalified consultants and contractors. 1. A design consultant is hired to design the project and produce construction plans. 2. Following design, the plans are advertised and constructors bid their best price to build the Project. 3. The low bid contractor builds the project according to the plans. This method is reliable and everyone understands what is expected. However it is very lengthy, restrictive of innovation and costly in design and oversight. Alternative methods used by CDOT over the last decade include: -Design-Build: One contractor team (designer and contractor) is hired, under one contract, to design and build the project concurrently based on a preliminary design or concept. -Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC): Similar to Design Bid Build but the designer and contractor are hired separately. 1. A design consultant is hired to design the project. 2. Construction contractor is hired at the same time to provide constructability input to the design consultant and develops a "guaranteed maximum price" to build the project. 3. If CDOT agrees with the maximum price the contractor builds the Project These methods provide the opportunity for a larger project for a fixed amount of money, innovative design partnerships between the contractor and CDOT, and allows for potential schedule improvements. Overall delivery is quickest with these methods. This CM/GC provides the opportunity for the contractor to influence the design and match their skills and resources to the Project. Overall delivery time is in-between Design Bid-Build and Design-Build. -Innovative Finance and Construction Methods: The Colorado High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) was formed to pursue innovative ways to finance, construct or operate and maintain transportation projects. Innovative financing is needed to offset the limited transportation funding available. The HPTE operates as a government owned business within the Colorado Department of Transportation. One innovative construction delivery method is a Public Private Partnership, "P3". In a public private partnership, a private partner finances the transportation project and agrees to design and construct the Project sometimes the private partner will even operate, and maintain the highway. The State retains full ownership of the highway. In return, the private partner receives the revenues from annual performance payments or toll lanes. The private partner is selected through an open and competitive process. In addition to providing additional sources of funding for transportation, these partnerships can also provide the opportunity for a larger project for a fixed amount of money and schedule improvements. The Colorado Transportation Commission has asked the High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) to explore financial options for the I-70 East project. For more information on the HPTE, visit [www.ColoradoHPTE.com](http://www.ColoradoHPTE.com). Comment Form I-70 East Supplemental Draft EIS Released for Public Comment The Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) has been released and is now available for public comment and review until 31 de Octubre del 2014. The Supplemental Draft EIS is available online: Reports Comments must be received by 31 de Octubre del 2014. Your comments are an important aid in making the best decision for transportation improvements in the corridor. They will be addressed in the Final EIS and play an important role in determining the preferred alternative. Please use the comment form to the right to submit your comments or use the printable form and mail them to the address listed below: SDEIS Public Comment Form - click for Printable FormClick to download: Printable

Alternative is better period

Please consider diverting I-70, between Wadsworth and Central Park Boulevard north to the I-270/I-76 corridor, while building a surface boulevard along Brighton Blvd. This "will rejuvenate the area and provide a vital gateway to Denver." This is a much more economical, environmentally and neighborhood-friendly solution. Thank you

I think the proposed widening of I-70 and placing it below grade is a tremendous waste of taxpayer money and really lacks 21st century vision. Great cities do not have highways running through them. Single occupancy commuting is becoming less and less desirable for people and is evident that it is not the future of cities. People want to live in the urban core and we have a chance to take back some of our urban core and connect it with the rest of the city. Why invest so much in a highway that helps to fragment our city? The impact of re-routing I-70 onto 270 makes so much sense, from a financial standpoint as well as from a city-building standpoint. I would love to see Denver take a leadership position among US cities and make a forward-thinking decision that ultimately will have far greater ramifications for our city moving forward. Other cities have already voted down huge road-building projects because of the price tag and the way it detracts from their cities. This is an opportunity for Denver to make a statement. Along with the good work that RTD has done for mass transit, and the ubiquitous office and residential development downtown, we can use this as a springboard to be like Portland, one of the hottest 21st century cities. Please do not rebuild this highway. The car has its place and function in all cities. It should not dominate. The sad part is that all the traffic engineers think this will decrease traffic. Ironically it will probably make traffic worse (induced demand). Rerouting it will naturally decrease traffic since people will seek alternate methods and routes.

Dear CDOT, I write to express my concerns with the existing EIS. It is unclear to me why CDOT thinks widening a highway through a city is a good idea. The I-270/I-76 reroute that has been discussed seems superior in the long run. One problem with the proposed I-70 trench appears to be the drainage complications. Another problem with the proposed I-70 trench appears to be the environmental impact on both the neighborhood and Swansea elementary. Another problem with the proposed I-70 trench is the continued devastation it would impose on property owners in North Denver...if indeed they even get to keep their property and aren't forced into a sale at prices that will prevent people from finding suitable replacement housing in Denver if uprooted. Please take the I-76/I-270 reroute option seriously! Thanks

My biggest concern relates to why the re-route that is on both I-270 & I-76 was not studied as a part of the SEIS? CDOT already owns the right-of-way needed to widen I-76 and I-270, without taking any homes or businesses and, along the I-76 and I-270 routes there are 0 neighborhoods that are immediately-adjacent to the freeways, compared to 11 along I-70 between Stapleton's Central Park Blvd and Harlan that are directly impacted. Would it be possible to simply reroute all commercial traffic to I-270/I-76 and leave I-70 as it is? Can CDOT at least try that out for a year or so before spending over a billion \$ in expanding I-70 and possibly creating a disaster for the city? I also wonder how CDOT expects to make a huge expansion to I-70 east of I-25 and no expansion west of I-25 without creating a bottleneck at I-25 which defeats the desired benefits? Is the expansion of I-70 west of I-25 next? If so, that will have a major negative impact on some of Denver's most desirable neighborhoods. Please consider all this before making this monstrous decision.

As an elementary public school teacher in NE Denver, I am in disbelief that CDOT is suggesting such a plan that will have devastating consequences to children. This is not acceptable. Especially, when there is a possibility that a re-route onto I-270 and I-76 [which has NOT been studied, contrary to the propaganda that suggests it has been but what was studied was not remotely the same route, using no part of I-76 and only a portion of I-270] may be in fact a better and less disruptive option. I think the SDESI is flawed because no amount of mitigation can sufficiently protect the children. I'm sympathetic to what the kids and families in Globeville, Elyria & Swansea and neighborhoods downwind might be subjected to: Exposure to lead and arsenic contamination. Because of the Asarco Smelter, Elyria, Swansea & Globeville neighborhoods are horribly contaminated based upon what I saw on the EPA website. The Superfund remediation in the 90s made it safe in yards with the topsoil around many houses replaced. But just a foot below, the contamination remains, especially in Globeville and Swansea. CDOT now intends to dig a 200 foot wide and 8,200+ foot long and 40 foot deep recessed freeway through almost exactly the middle of three badly-contaminated neighborhoods? And, people will continue living in their homes, going to those schools and kids playing outside during years of this excavation and dirt removal? My house in Whittier sometimes gets stockshow smells, which means that we too, at times, might be breathing whats getting dug-up over there. These airborne toxins will be breathed in by adults and children. These toxins have DIRECT links to not only seemingly innocuous conditions like asthma, but also respiratory failure and brain damage!-There are already greatly-elevated rates of asthma & respiratory issues for children in those communities and very significant amounts of the pollution come from vehicles on I-70. More traffic means more pollution. This traffic should be routed AWAY from these neighborhoods, not THROUGH them. -The kids are in danger getting to school. Garden Place and Swansea Elementary Schools draw students from both sides of I-70. The ability to cross from one side of the freeway to the other even today is not good. Once the freeway is below ground, the number of crossing points is reduced to a third - maybe even less during construction. Children and families will face greater difficulty getting to school. The thing that really scares me is the four more feeder road lanes that are 80 feet wide that are not in the recessed areas. The trucking companies in the very nearby industrial areas will be running trucks up and down those lanes all the time, especially with the removal of the York/Josephine and some of the Steele/Vasquez exits. Crossing there will be terrifying. Accidents will occur and could injure [or worse] kids standing on the side waiting to cross. Who will take responsibility for those injuries? -Rumor is that they are planning on putting the new playground on the top of the 900-foot long unventilated lid over the freeway? Kids climb and play on attractive nuisances. Children dare each other to do the darndest things. I envision nightmares of a kid climbing a sound wall. This is not a safe design plan. -The noise of the 24-hour per day construction is going to disrupt learning hugely. Watching dump trucks is wonderful for some little boys and girls too- but when it prevents them from learning or sleeping, that's a big problem. Has anyone thought about how the actual construction (which will take a very long time) will impact the community? -The pollution from the trucks and tractors removing something in the range of 50,000 loads of dirt will be far greater than other construction projects in recent history, including the construction of I-25. Idling vehicles of gridlocked commuters will be commonplace many hours each day and that air pollution impacts those communities. Just because it cannot always been seen (though haze and smog is becoming more visible even in Denver) does not mean it is not there! Instead, a re-route of this project allows them to re-do & widen I-270 & I-76 before anything gets touched in the neighborhoods. Then, taking-down the existing viaduct and slightly-widening the existing 46th Ave is a fraction of the work of a mammoth recessed freeway. Why is this not being proposed as a viable option? -Families and communities are getting torn apart. CDOT will be telling people they must leave their homes. Some have been there for many years. Some may have family or their only friends on their existing block. It's not fair. These communities do not need to be torn apart. Finally, I see the potential for some good developments for the community if there was a 46th Avenue boulevard style road once the freeway is re-routed, something like a town's main street. A place for a grocery store, which those three communities are lacking. A place for people to meet neighbors. The SE-quarter of Globeville has that now, but the rest of Globeville and no part of Elyria & Swansea have that and the tiny hints of what seems like community retail will be torn-down to make the freeway a lot wider. Though I have presented many concerns here, among the most pressing is the issue of pollution and deadly toxins in the breathing air of thousands and thousands of Denver residents. The city cannot ignore this certainty, and must instead commit to maintaining a safe environment for its residents.

To Whom it may concern:

I am writing to provide my input, both personally and professionally about the proposed project. I am in support to the alternative route using I-76 and 270, and against the route using the existing I-70 corridor. I, along with a number of Realtors have followed the conversation for a couple of years. I was originally ok with the decision to lower I-70 and keep the current route, but after reading the project specifics and talking to a variety of business and real estate professionals, I now support the alternative option to reroute the highway.

1. Driving that section, it is apparent that the highway was jammed into that space to begin with and was a bad idea. Over the years sentiment toward core urban neighborhoods has changed and to lower the highway, widen it to 12 lanes, then in a "feel good" proposal to placate neighborhood activists with a "connecting park" is a joke. It will no more connect those two sides of a very wide highway than if you left it the way it is now.
2. I looked at the drainage proposal and am reminded of I-25 and Alameda. Now after years and millions of dollars in new drainage, it still fills with water when storms come through. The same thing will happen here by building a longer "canal". The size of the drainage pipes, where they will drain with mag Chloride and dirt, and the lack of sun.. ever. in that trench will never be solved. The first big storm after construction is completed will be a nightmare with stranded cars, motorists, and debris. Look for someone to drown in the event.
3. The neighborhoods both north and south of the "canal" will continue to be negatively effected by the noise, pollution, and congestion that it experiences today. Widening the highway to 12 lanes will destroy many more low income houses and devastate the school on the north side of the highway. The plan shows a northside service road that will be clogged 24/7 creating as much havoc as the elevated does now. It also puts the school and its students at the same grade as semis and heavy traffic. For some reason (I think poor design) all Denver freeways seem to have way too many exits and on-ramps. A freeway is not a street with intersections every few hundred yards. This redesign will only make that situation worse.
4. That covers east of I-25. West of I-25, even though will be at or around grade, if increased to 12 lanes will further split and destroy the enormous economic growth and resurgence of all of NW Denver. As a Realtor based in the Tennyson Street Shopping and Arts District and a long time resident of NW Denver, I can tell you it will negatively impact the neighborhoods from Chaffee Park and Regis University to Berkeley Lake and Willis Case Golf Course. I sat on the Citizens Advisory Commission for the Berkeley Park Master Plan and noise, space, and pollution were all big topics and challenges to that plan. If the existing highway path is redeveloped over time with a boulevard that actually does connect neighborhoods north and south of its current path, the economic benefits will far outweigh any benefits of leaving the highway where it is.
5. If the highway were rerouted to I-76 and 270 it would build on land already owned by CDOT, would go through areas that will never develop like the city neighborhoods that have already developed in the urban neighborhoods where the highway currently runs, there will be less infrastructure to move, and it will sacrifice fewer existing buildings and homes. You will never convince me that the cost for the alternative route will be more expensive.

I believe the plan promoted by the administration and CDOT is more politically motivated than design and engineering likes to suggest. As a side note, I have become increasingly sensitive to freeway noise and believe any design should consider road materials that quiet the traffic, not make it scream. After driving in a number of states with a variety of freeway surfaces, it occurs to me that other states are doing a far better job. Highways within metro areas should be required to use quieting materials to pave freeways.

The Preliminary Identified Preferred Alternative is not viable. Submerged traffic lanes will require ongoing pumping of water due to proximity of underground lanes to Platte River drainage basin. I oppose the Preliminary Identified Preferred Alternative on the grounds that maintenance requirements have not been fully vetted nor priced. I urge CDOT to continue to explore cheaper, less costly solutions, including the re-routing of I-70 through Denver on the existing I-76 right-of-way. CDOT owns the land and none of the lanes will need to be submerged.

C-DOT should consider re-routing the interstate to the current I-76, I-270 corridor and widen that corridor. I am very concerned about the environmental impacts of widening I-70 in its current location. In addition, when looking ahead to the future development of north Denver that corridor would be better served with a boulevard and business district rather than an interstate highway. With the opening of RTDs east and north lines, the renovation and improvements to the stock show complex, the development of the Brighton Blvd. corridor, and its proximity to downtown, this area is ripe for revitalization. Please consider another way forward. Please reunite the communities that have been torn apart by I-70. Please move the interstate just a little bit north!

I believe it is now time to remove I-70 from I-25 east to I-270 and be replaced by a grid pattern of surface streets and boulevards. I-70 and other high speed highways have increased air pollution, brought excessive noise from freight trucks often carrying hazardous materials. The nearby neighborhoods have suffered the most and been consulted the least. Air quality at Swansea Elementary School, for example, is poorer than elsewhere. What studies have been conducted to measure the effects of automobiles, trains, buses and other motor-powered vehicles at high altitude? Environmental justice has long been denied to those citizens and neighborhoods most impacted by I-70 and other high speed highways in the Denver metro area. Finally, in my view, the proposed CDOT I-70 proposal will likely cost far more than proposed. That money could be better spent on rebuilding a grid pattern of surface streets and boulevards and alternative transportation such as light rail and trolleys that will encourage economic development, reduce air and noise pollution and improve neighborhood ambience. Build transportation for the future, not the past.

I'd like to put in my comments on the I-70 expansion. (I'm a native to CO and live near Lowell and I-70.)

\*First Choice:\*

I would most prefer to have the bridge widened but still elevated.

\*Second Choice:\*

I could live with the "cut and cover" proposal, but have concerns of traffic coming to a halt in rush hour in an enclosed underpass. I get panic attacks easily in road tunnels and this would be a worry of mine if the underpass ever came to a complete stop. I'd also be concerned if there were ever a major traffic accident under the pass. Would there be ambulance and police lanes to get in and out in heavy traffic? Would they be able to get traffic moving again quickly? (I realize this could also happen on an elevated bridge, but I think it's worth posing the question.)

\*Very Against:\*

United North Metro Denver's proposal to turn I-70 into a boulevard and rerouting traffic to 270 and I-76. The area on I-70 from Wadsworth to I-25 has always been so fast (even in rush hour.) To turn that route into a boulevard and take away the fastest part of I-70 seems like a big mistake...not to mention the extra time it will take to get back on I-70 East heading to DIA from where I live. Thanks for reading

The proposed SDEIS is not a project worth pursuing, because it does not take into account the health of the many communities near I-70. It is criminal, immoral, and I am taking legal action should CDOT decide to proceed. To dig the trench, CDOT proposes to dig deep into the heavily contaminated Asarco Superfund Clean-Up Site, which, as everyone is aware, contains at least cadmium, lead, arsenic, and zinc. How does CDOT plan to contain wind from blowing contaminated dust to surrounding communities? How does CDOT plan to prevent flooding after digging a trench below the level of the Platte River? How will winter ice be dealt with in your new death trap? NIH and EPA studies directly relate exposure to traffic related air pollution to cardiovascular disease, respiratory disease, lung disease, asthma, autism in newborns, lower life expectancy, diabetes, etc... Garden Place Elementary and Swansea Elementary are in the most contaminated areas because of CDOT's corruption in the 1960's. I can't imagine anyone at CDOT lives near the proposed death plan. Why is that? Your efforts to exclude the Spanish speakers in north Denver is a clear violation of Executive Order 13166, which makes this a federal issue. The Health Impact Assessment shows that this project will be in violation of the Clean Air Act. I am working against this project with the support of civil rights groups, health centers, environmental groups, elected officials, professors, several attorneys, and all of north Denver. I advocate a study assessing a reroute of I70 through I270 and I76, which are industrial areas. CDOT would not have to purchase any land, or destroy any houses or businesses to expand I270 and I76. Multiple studies show that 40% of the traffic (mostly semi's) would follow the re-route, 40% would follow what would be a tree-lined boulevard where I-70 currently is, and the remaining 20% would be able to travel a more suitable route for them, due to increased accessibility to downtown Denver. We believe this alternative would cost a fraction of the \$1.8 billion expected for the current proposed plan. I would like to further discuss the reroute alternative. I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you for your time.

The data justifying the i-70 expansion plan is outdated and will have a negative societal and economic impact for the next generation. With more reliance on public transportation, due to the light rail proliferation, traffic on i-70 has decreased over the last ten years and will continue to do so. Once again neglecting the long-neglected Swansea, Elyria, and Globeville neighborhoods would be a travesty, while there is an easy solution to increase property values and quality of life in this neighborhood by creating a boulevard. This is the classic case of a sunk cost, where developers and researchers have been working hard over many years towards this expansion plan. Even though it doesn't make sense anymore, the time and money already invested is a key factor in the decision-making process, while it should be the future impact that drives the decisions. City highway systems have been torn down and replaced in cities like San Francisco and Milwaukee, which have seen economic gains along the now-vibrant boulevards. \$1.8 billion is what this project would cost, changing 1-70 from 6 to 10 lanes, instead of the much cheaper alternative of re-routing i-70 along the 1-270/i-76 corridor (outside of the city) and building a stronger community within.

I support a reroute through industrial I-270 and I-76 sending the semi's and travelers passing Denver an extra 1.8 miles. It could change what is currently I-70 into a tree-lined boulevard similar to Martin Luther King Blvd. Traffic would be much more evenly distributed because people would have so many options. It would also integrate those communities north of current I-70 with the rest of Denver, making property values increase substantially. Plus, we wouldn't have to breathe all of the pollutants from the trucks. CDOT owns all the land they would need for this reroute, so they wouldn't need to demolish any homes or businesses like they are intending to do now.

Hello. I am a middle school teacher at Bruce Randolph School, and I am concerned about many things regarding the I-70 East plans. Expanding I-70 in such a dramatic fashion will have significant impacts on the surrounding communities. I can already see the difficulties the Swansea neighborhoods face, and this seems like too much. The costs and massive construction needs of the "Cut-and-Cover" plan are staggering. I already see the difficulties of seemingly minor construction, let alone a plan of this magnitude. Also, maintaining this underground highway appears very difficult. Either the expanded elevated plan or the proposed I-270/I-76 diversion plan seem like much better choices to me.

Find something better to spend money on!!!!

The plan is a terrible idea long term. I am certain they can come up with a better plan.

While I-70 is in need of repair, I would much rather see the State of Colorado put the money the I-70 East project would cost into repairing all of the hundreds of roads and bridges in the state that are in dire need of repair. If you have ever driven in other states, you must know that Colorado's roads are in an embarrassing and dangerous condition. While I am aware that 'reuniting neighborhoods' was one of the desired outcomes of this project; the neighborhoods have been separated for over 50 years. How many of the residents still remember who lived where? Have the residents there been pushing for such a project? Regarding lowering the highway below grade; what an insane idea considering what will happen with a moderate to heavy rainfall! Wasn't the recent renovation of I-25 done in order to correct some of its flood-prone areas? Imagine what a mess it will be when 12 lanes of traffic is brought to a standstill because of flooding under the landscaped cover. It would be good to create more ways to travel between the neighborhoods by making all of the north-south streets go through (under the highway) and to provide safe pedestrian sidewalks alongside them. Build the neighborhoods a park (or parks) elsewhere, but don't lower or cover the roadbed. That's a lot of money for one project; please consider using it throughout the entire state to repair existing roads.

I prefer the proposed reroute along 270/76, and encourage you to pursue it. The neighborhoods in NE and NW Denver which touch interstate 70 would be improved and better integrated, particularly Swansea/Globeville.

I am a Colorado native and I am writing in support of re-routing I-70. I am sincerely asking for CDOT to conduct an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76.

- The current route of I-70 has had devastating impacts within the neighborhoods of not only Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea, but also the historically rich neighborhoods of Sunnyside, Berkeley, and Lakeside.

- o These neighborhoods are full of beautiful older homes, lots of small businesses, and this entire area has become more and more popular in the last decade. People are now flocking towards city neighborhoods where they can walk or ride a bike to go get coffee or go see a baseball game.

- o Public transportation has grown immensely in the Denver area and only further connects these growing neighborhoods, promoting a higher quality of life, a more convenient and active lifestyle and drastically increased home value.

- RTD has already approved Light Rail to expand through Northwest Denver with a station at 41st and Fox St.

- Re-routing I-70 provides the opportunity to create more businesses in conjunction with the Light Rail expansion, provide more jobs, better walkability, and repair the harm that has been caused.

- o I live in a quaint bungalow build in 1906 in the beautiful Sunnyside neighborhood. I can bicycle to downtown Denver in 10 minutes and the neighborhood is connected to the Highlands and Berkeley neighborhoods. My home is also 1 block south of I-70 which is invasive, loud, and separates Sunnyside from the Chaffee Park neighborhood.

- o Rocky Mountain Lake Park and Berkeley Lake Park are both beautiful lakes with paths, tree, amenities, and historical homes that border them. On the north end of both lakes immediately sits I-70, which to say the least is not physically attractive and is also very loud and invasive. I love to go running and I honestly never run around the entire lake but turn around due to the intrusiveness of I-70.

- The current route of I-70 directly divides historical neighborhoods from 48th and Pecos all the way West to N. Harlan St., The current route of I-270 and I-76 is overwhelmingly less invasive and largely industrialized land in comparison.

- The Highway Cover option that has been proposed may solve the current issues at hand but DOES NOT create a permanent solution that promotes and ensures the quality of life that has come to be expected in Denver.

- o On the CDOT website it is stated, "CDOT has no plans to widen I-70 between I-25 and Wadsworth Boulevard, and no projects with this goal are contemplated for the next two decades." As stated above, this is not a permanent solution for the betterment of Denver citizens. Twenty years is not a very long time and it would be a shame to expand on the current I-70 route, further damaging the potential to really make Denver a great place to live for future generations.

- Westbound traffic on I-70 West of I-25 is often backed-up and expansion is inevitable in the route is not changed.

- IF A HIGHWAY SYSTEM IS ALREADY IN PLACE IN A MOSTLY INDUSTRIALIZED AREA, AND THE OPPORTUNITY ARISES TO CONSOLIDATE AND EXPAND THAT HIGHWAY SYSTEM AND DRASTICALLY IMPACT THE COMMUNITY IN A POSITIVE WAY, AS WELL AS RESOLVE TRAFFIC CONJECTION ISSUES, WHY WOULD THAT OPTION NOT BE CONSIDEREE? WHY WAS THE FULL RE-ROUTE ON BOTH I-270 AND I-76 NOT STUDIES AS PART OF THE SEIS?

Good morning,

The current SDEIS is not acceptable. Below are National Institute of Health studies directly connecting exposure to traffic related air pollution to various deadly diseases. These studies were not available when I-70 was railroaded through north Denver communities, including my own, in the 1960's. THEY ARE NOW!!!

With this information, it is your responsibility to do further research on an I-270/I-76 reroute that would take the pollutants diesel trucks out of residential neighborhoods. CDOT's dismissal explanation in SDEIS (Vol I, Ch. 3.5 & Vol II, Ch. 4.1) is insufficient and incorrect. Further studies have been conducted on traffic distribution by Peter Park and CU-D Graduate School of Urban Planning and Design, which puts in question the SDEIS forecast of traffic. CDOT's grossly overestimates the cost for the reroute by double-billing I-270 construction costs and incorrect calculations.

CDOT misrepresents the number of households to be destroyed at 53 by not counting duplexes, triplexes, or long term dwelling units. Businesses that will be destroyed were unaware until I spoke with them in the past week. With a reroute, CDOT would not have to destroy any houses, businesses, or lives (including my own) by expanding I-76 and I-270. That is exactly what is happening now.

Please read at least the summaries of these NIH studies.

Autism - NIH Study

Conclusions: Exposure to traffic-related air pollution, nitrogen dioxide, PM2.5, and PM10 during pregnancy and during the first year of life was associated with autism.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23404082>

Cardiovascular Mortality - NIH Study

Conclusions: Traffic-related air pollution at relatively low concentrations in Ontario was associated with increased mortality from cardiovascular disease.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23222554>

Cardiopulmonary Mortality - NIH Study

Conclusions: Cardiopulmonary mortality was associated with living near a major road and, less consistently, with the estimated ambient background concentration.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12401246>

ADHD (Hyperactivity) - NIH Study

Conclusions: Elemental carbon associated with traffic (ECAT) exposure during infancy was associated with higher Hyperactivity scores in children.

<http://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/1205555/>

Adverse Birth Outcomes - NIH Study

Conclusions: Our findings in a population-based study add to an expanding literature that links several traffic-derived air pollutants (e.g., NO, NO2, CO) to adverse birth outcomes, particularly increased risk of SGA birth weight. In addition, we observed consistent associations between PM2.5 exposure and risk of preterm birth.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2367679/?too>

Lung Cancer - NIH Study

Conclusions: We found evidence for an association of exposure to black smoke and traffic with lung cancer incidence in people who had never smoked.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18633326>

Respiratory Function - NIH Study

Conclusions: Exposure to moderate levels of locally emitted air pollution from traffic early in life appears to influence the development of airway disease and sensitization in preschool children.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18379426>

Asthma - NIH Study

Conclusions: The results are consistent with the hypothesis that long term exposure to traffic related outdoor air pollutants such as NOx, CO, and O3 increases the risk of asthma in children. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15923246>

I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you.

I have been a long time resident and user of the I-70 corridor and grew up in the area. I have seen the various changes to the corridor including when it when to an overhead design. I am an engineer, designer, contractor and developer by training and 30 years of experience.

My constructive comments:

History tells us that it takes approximately 20 years to finish a highway improvement project, from the recognition of the need to the finished product. Approvals, financing, design, construction, etc., etc..

Therefore planning should be 20+ years into the future and not be based on current data (or past) design criteria, but future predictions of need.

The plan you are presenting is simply too narrow, it has to few lanes. The number of lanes should be doubled at the very least.

This section of I-70 has been a very big problem for 40+ years and continues to be a bottleneck that can be improved. The political will should be taken now to widen the corridor, that includes acquiring the land necessary including a portion of the stock show area. The stock show parking, and older facilities, etc., can be moved to the North. There is a lot of undeveloped land to the North and blighted areas that desirous of improvement.

The over park area will only slow traffic down and increase further backups and driver confusion. Based on our experience of the old airport overpasses, maintenance of the facility will be very costly (prohibitively so) and an inefficient use of scarce resources. The cost of this area should be saved and used for acquiring more land of other more effective uses of scarce resources.

The toxic gases coming from vehicle emissions is highly poisonous and is well known. Exposing people to this environment is ill advised, and could create an unnecessary liability. To also think that people can enjoy a park over such an environment is short sighted. The area will simply not be used, and the need is not justified based on the population, etc., plus there is ample land available to the North for such facilities if necessary, with adequate parking etc..

I am vehemently opposed to the current plans for I70. I am begging CDOT to do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Here is why it is important to me: 1. This is grossly unfair to Elyria Swansea and Globeville. You're taking advantage of an already impoverished community that doesn't have the resources to stand up and be heard. Imagine if you proposed widening 6th Ave through the Country Club neighborhood...plenty of people with money there that have resources and connections to protect their best interests. Not the same here. You're taking advantage, plain and simple. 2. I live in Berkeley. If the current plan goes through, in a few years you will try to expand west of 25, further impacting an OLD and ESTABLISHED neighborhood that is THRIVING. Why do this? Especially when you could impact no homes and neighborhoods by rerouting? 3. Two miles of highway underground sounds like a nightmare. A nightmare to build, a nightmare in the icy winter weather, and a nightmarish financial burden on tax payers that don't even want this. Again, I ask you to do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76.

I feel that the expansion of I-70 will be devastating to several Denver communities and I do not support it. I feel that CDOT should look at the I-270 and I-76 corridor to reroute the congested I-70 lanes. This would not impact any communities.

CDOT Administrator:

The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Process was deficient because it did not comply with Sec. 771.129 (a) of the Federal Highway Administration Regulations which states: "A written evaluation of the draft EIS shall be prepared by the applicant in cooperation with the Administration if an acceptable final EIS is not submitted to the Administration within 3 years from the date of the draft EIS circulation. The purpose of this evaluation is to determine whether a supplement to the draft EIS or a new draft EIS is needed."

Reconstruction and widening of I-70 east is long overdue. The elevated highway obviously is crumbling and was never intended to accommodate current levels of traffic. The elevated highway has had a terrible impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Moving the highway below grade and covering over the highway in places will reduce noise and connect neighborhoods that are now separated. Some houses will need to be torn down to make room for the project, but the number of homes affected is very small for a project of this magnitude. I am skeptical of claims by Dennis Gallagher that residents have more cardiovascular disease as a result of the existing highway. All variables need to be considered in evaluating this claim, including lower standards of living in the surrounding neighborhood which affect residents' access to health care and nutritious food. Denver is growing. RTD is creating alternatives to driving which will help alleviate congestion, but there is going to be more traffic whether we like it or not. Cars have already become much cleaner than 30 years ago, and electric cars will become much more prevalent during the next 20 years. The health impact of vehicle emissions is a declining factor in the location of highways. Anyone can look at the elevated portion of I-70 and see that something must be done. I used to think that the highway could be shifted north to the I-270/I-76 corridor, but most of the I-70 traffic is headed into Denver rather than passing around Denver. Improvements to I-70 are the only sensible course of action.

As a 31 year resident of north Denver I have been a regular user of I-70, including a commute through Globeville for 22 of those years. I strongly support study of a reroute alternative to the proposed expansion of I-70 east of I-25 that would utilize I-270 and I-76. As a health care professional, my commute through Globeville was to a health center located within 1.5 miles of I-70. The air quality issues associated with likely increased traffic on I-70 present a high likelihood of increased risk for acute and chronic lung disease for the population living in close proximity, including over a dozen schools. The original choice to route I-70 through the Elyria, Swansea and Globeville neighborhoods can be seen as an example in environmental injustice in that too few power people resided in the impacted area to prevent it from happening in the first place. The proposed widening of I-70 in its current location seems to multiply that injustice. It involves not just businesses but homes. The alternative route seems to involve less residential impact, which is preferable in my view and worthy of serious study. The cost of the proposed project which includes so much work below grade seems to greatly outweigh the benefit; and deserves a thorough comparison with the alternative which would be entirely above grade.

Please, Please, Please consider re-routing I-70 to the I-270/I-76 Corridor. There is ample space for multiple lanes that will not affect people's homes. This is an industrial area that should be where out of State travelers should drive with their polluting automobiles, and trucks full of hazardous materials. We want Denver to be a livable, beautiful place to live and increasing lanes of I-70 through neighborhoods will only serve to increase local pollution and force thousands of people out of their homes. There is an alternative, please think about it

Expanding I-70 to ten lanes will create even more air pollution in neighborhoods that already suffer from low socio-economic status, air pollution that could contribute to health issues of the people living in those neighborhoods causing significant impact on their health including a significant financial cost which those living in these communities can not afford. Frankly, this project will make poor people more unhealthy and poorer, not what our Denver community needs. Expanding I-70 is a billion dollar project that taxpayers can't afford and aren't willing to fund. Expanding I-70 to ten lanes will further destroy neighborhoods and makes worse the lives of the people in these neighborhoods from health to economics. An alternative boulevard approach would in these neighborhoods that have been split for over 30 years and increase the health and economic well-being of these neighborhoods. This is the right thing to do with upcoming rail lines winding through these neighborhoods and for the development and growth of the city of Denver that is inclusive of all neighborhoods and people. I recommend that CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76 prior to proceeding with this project.

I-70 through Globeville. I think the highway engineers have forgotten what a mess to traffic a tunnel on I-70 is. When DIA was opened it was almost the same day that they started to tear down the two tunnels that were part of runways at old Stapleton. The reason was traffic related - people slow down for tunnels and create backups. The new tunnel will have the same effect and cause terrible traffic congestion, accidents, etc. Please consider the alternate and expand I-270 / I-76. Thank you.

The I-70 expansion is indeed a "boondoggle" as expressed by Dennis Gallagher in the Park Hill News in October. At a time when alternative transportation should be receiving emphasis and funding, building a mega-highway that bisects Denver is wrong on nearly every level. A fraction of the 1.8 billion could be used to provide sidewalks in parts of Denver that are hostile to pedestrians, safe crossings for pedestrians and school children, bike lanes, separate bike paths, and policy that encourages alternative transportation. As Los Angeles, Atlanta, Dallas, and other large cities in America have proven, traffic cannot be out-built with wider roads. This expansion of I-70 is at the wrong time, done in the wrong way, and will be viewed in 20 years as shortsighted, wasteful, and the wrong path. Denver needs a smart plan for traffic. This is not it.

C-DOT Proposed changes to I-70 corridor need to be slowed down and thought through. The alternative proposal of connecting I-70 to existing I-76 would mitigate so many concerns reflective of C-DOT plan. 1) I-76 already exists and I-70 interchange off Wadsworth/Harlan exits would take the traffic away from residential neighborhoods. 2) Impact of neighborhoods near existing viaduct would be devastating to an already poor neighborhoods cut in half by I-70. 3) Putting a highway half way underground will collect emissions and create an environmental air quality issue. Has there been an "official" EPA impact completed? 4) Has the alternative been considered? 5) Why is C-DOT opposed to looking at alternative? 6) Hazardous materials on trucks would be directed north of town on the I-76 plan. 7) We don't need to become LA

The proposed plan is horrible on so many levels. I have a friend who lives in this area and we enjoy walks around Berkeley Lake frequently. She walks her dog their daily. The expense, expanse and visual impact of this project is uncalled for when other plans are less expensive, less polluting and more environmentally sound. This money could be more wisely spend on light rail, an alternate route, without impacting disadvantaged neighborhoods, children and the environment. Please do not override important public opinion on this project, and listen to the engineers and folks who live in this area who are more knowledgeable than I. Thank you

I am a 24 year old mother of an active 2 year old girl. My grandparents, who raised me and 3 other siblings, have lived in Swansea for eight years. All four of us siblings now have our own children, whom my grandparents babysit. This I-70 expansion will greatly impact the neighborhood of Swansea among others in a number of ways. The most important being the air quality, the effect it will have on the school and students, as well as noise levels. The air quality in Swansea has already tested as one of the highest air pollution neighborhoods in the state, with traffic from the highway along with industrial smog coming from Commerce City as well factories like Purina. The new highway will only increase traffic to the area and further increase pollution rates. Digging up contaminated soil that will travel through the air and into my daughter's (and many other children s) nose whilst she play's outside and not knowing how it will impact her is not a risk I am willing to take. The noise from the construction will no doubt be loud and bothersome to residents but even worse for the staff and students at Swansea Elementary. The students will be distracted and the teachers will have to attempt to teach over the sound of bull dossers and tractors. And what about the school location? How is the expansion going to impact the school property, will they have to cut into the school's playground and even if they don't imagine all that contaminated dirt being blown around right next to where these children play everyday. The expansion is going to hurt the neighborhood more than help it.

I have concerns that the current plan will be very expensive, while increasing pollution, with no solid answers about how additional pollution and other issues (for example pumping contimated ground water safely) will be addressed. Furthermore, this only address one small section of the highway, congestion is also an issue on the west side of I-70. I would not feel comfortable sending my childeren to Swansea Elementary becuae of noise and pollution concerns. From what I understand several schools are within the EPA impact Zone, this would only make matters worse. Why are there no alternative plans? I request CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes I-220 and I-76. Thank you

Please do not increase the lanes on I70! It will cause a nightmare for those of us who regularly use I70 to get around town with traffic jams and such. There are no good reasons for the increase of lanes. None! It will only cause confusion and traffic holdups. None of us who have traveled in other states want to see a travel fiasco like Los Angeles, CA or Houston, TXp. It would not be conducive for out of town travelers either. Increasing the I70 corridor would be outmoded before it would be finished and then what? Those of us on the Northwest side of Denver and West side of Denver would require three times as long to get to a destination on the East side of Denver. Widening I70 is not progress! I want to see Denver be progressive. Others also want to see Denver be a "pace-setter". The widening of I70 is not a positive "pace-setting" move. Thank you for your consideration

Hello,  
I have one concern and to me it is a major concern:  
Comment: In the development of the I-70 East EIS Corridor, ensure highway off ramps are adequately broadened and lengthened, and that yield signs, stop signs, and traffic lights at the end of highway off ramps don't remain an impediment to smoother and more continuous traffic flow off the highway as they are now. Fix the off ramp issue because if you don't, it won't matter how broad you make the highway, it will remain as a major issue for slow and bottlenecked traffic. If you are "going to do it" right", then this must be done.

I am 100% AGAINST privatizing our freeways, or any portion thereof. If you need outside funding, then use a bond issue, backed by covering the entire sub-grade project and leasing the 'created' at grade real estate, which will create a revenue stream for you in perpetuity. Covering the entire project will accomplish both, solving this revenue stream issue, and prevent weather related issues from causing closure due to flooding or snow/ice impoundments.

I am writing to voice my concern with the I-70 expansion project. I feel that highways should not be run through cities, and should go around cities. I live in the Berkeley Park neighborhood, and I see the effect that it has on my neighbors north of I-70. They are separated from their southern neighbors with only a few areas to cross the massive highway. I know this is also true of our neighbors East of Brighton Blvd. I frequently walk my dogs around Berkeley Park Lake, and the constant noise is a nuisance. There is always trash littered up to the highway fence, which is unsightly and diminishes property values due to the litter and noise. I am also concerned about the air quality in the neighborhood and schools due to the highway. Pollution is inevitable due to all of the cars and trucks on the highway. I am a licensed chemical engineer in the state of Colorado who frequently deals with emissions in the Oil and Gas industry so I do understand this matter. I am very much in favor of CDOT doing an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. My opinion as a resident of north Denver is that this would benefit the city.

I have a strong objection to the "cover" in the planned alternative that would build an almost four-acre landscaped cover over the interstate by Swansea Elementary School. The last time a "cover" was placed over I-70 near this area was when the runways from Stapleton Airport were constructed and I-70 traffic passed below the runways. This runway cover or tunnel over the lanes of I-70 created a slow down of traffic which seriously backed up at high volume times. As the Denver area increased in population and traffic increased the problem continued to get worse. I know this because I've lived in Colorado for 34 years and experienced it first hand. It was a welcome relief, and a subject touted by CDOT, that the runway cover over I-70 was demolished and that traffic no longer would have this impedimet to smooth flow when the new Denver International Airport was put into service. Indeed, once the "cover" was gone, traffic moved very well with no slowing. Coming back to the "cover" for the planned alternative, the same problem will develop and motorists will be frustrated and traffic impeded. I do not believe that even if strong lighting is used in the tunnel, that it will stop this past problem from redeveloping.  
Please, don't build the "cover."

There are MUCH better alternatives and worth exploring. I am a multiple business owner and multiple property owner in Northwest Denver and the I-270/I-76 re-route seems to make a lot of sense on a lot of levels. Why not really look at the best and healthiest alternative(s) and make the correct choice?



To whom it may concern: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this topic. I have represented many clients in the neighborhoods that will be affected/AFFLICTED! I know of NO ONE that wants this to happen, what are WE THINKING, OR WHY ARE WE NOT THINKING! Why do we want to endanger many of our most precious neighborhoods! We are supposed to be PROACTIVE, BRIGHT AND CARING CITIZENS AND WE ARE! Where is our government representation on this issue; we are not being served as the citizens we are, we are strong, caring and environmentally concerned! We do not want our families ingesting even more toxic pollution and noise pollution. These are historic neighborhoods; and it will not stop at Globeville, you know we are right; this will all bottle neck, and more neighborhoods will be impacted in time. Why is this so clear to so many, and so UNCLEAR/UNCARING to others! Why with all of the land/industrial setting are we not all over the I-76 re-route! Please, SOMEONE, LISTEN AND CARE, and LEARN, THIS IS A HORRIBLE PLAN TO USE I-70! Thank you.

How can the city and State actually think that widening I-70 is a good solution? I thought that Colorado thought outside the box and would actually look into better solutions. Running the highway up I-76 would alleviate a ton of traffic that doesn't need to be right next to our local neighborhoods! Running it up I-76 would bring more value to the local homes, give downtown a much need revitalization on the north side, and save the kids in Swansea from dealing with a highway (parents will move before putting their kids there). Having a new "local" thoroughfare in place of I-70 near downtown would increase property values everywhere, and the city will continue to boom (I am a Realtor with Coldwell Banker in Downtown, and have been for 10+ years) so I know how this will play out. Please reroute I-70 up to I-76 and around Denver's CBD instead of bringing more congestion closer to town where it will ruin lives and continue to depreciate land values around it!!!!

Hello,  
I am supportive of the proposal detailed in the Supplemental Draft EIS. In particular, the I-70 corridor needs substantial improvement in order to help continue development of the area of town that I live in, the Green Valley Ranch area. The areas of Far Northeast Denver and North Aurora will see substantial development over the next decades, particularly the E-470 corridor, including the proposed Gaylord Resort. I-70 improvements must be made in order to accommodate development out towards DIA and eastward. Thank you for the opportunity to review the plan and to comment.

The I-70 East project seems to forget one major item: the people whose lives and homes are to be impacted with this project. Since the first interstate highway went in during the Eisenhower Administration, citizens have been displaced, property has been seized, lives have been disrupted. I would think that since the '50s, we have learned to do better. By following existing corridors along railroad tracks and other natural configurations, such as moving the route north, would make the least impact on these neighborhoods. Also, consideration needs to be given to the nature and form of commuting in the next 30-50 years. Perhaps our reliance on cars won't be as heavy as alternatives will be in place. If there were to be a wide concrete ribbon halving, then quartering the area, this would give the impression that more lanes is better and that we can continue to widen our roads when traffic increases instead of exploring other less land-encroaching ways. Finally, I remem! ber how East I-70 traffic was slowed to an almost standstill some days when going under the jet runway by the old DIA. By putting the I-70 corridor underneath again, the same thing will happen. It is human nature to slow down in a tunnel. thank you for your consideration.

We very much believe that I 70 needs considerable improvement through Denver.....and we also agree that the prefered option of lowering the freeway is the best alternative. We spent several years in Phoenix where they did the same thing with I10 and it is a very effecient and pleasing part of downtown Phoenix.....don't delay, get I 70 fixed. Thanks

We are worried about the amount of dust that will be generated once you start demolishing the bridge.  
We are worried about the noise and vibration that will be created during construction  
What is going to happen with the truck traffic once the proeject starts, because the traffic is horrible?  
We support the Partial Cover Lowered Basic Option and the roundabout at Vasquez Blvd.

Cap by school I- destructive to kids - walls are bad  
Cap does not connect neighborhood - too many 10' walls between openings.  
Why not try the boulevard idea as suggested. Where did the alternative of rebuilding a viaduct go?  
That has always been an option until now? Why not rebuild the viaduct. CDOT - Let us see your compassion. This neighborhood certainly doesn't need toll roads or 10 lane I-70.

New bridge not needed at this time. Do not think cost of project renders benefits that are commensurate. Do not like the idea of managed lanes.

Your #'s are way high on using I-270 as an alternative route. Shame on you for padding the numbers for that alternative (& very viable) idea. I couldn't say it better than Auditor Dennis Gallagher (see attached) AND the gentlemen who call the 10 lanes w/cover I-70 idea "the longest widest lap pool ever built."  
Stupid plan & Denver doesn't need it.  
Dennis Gallagher's Top 10 Reasons to Stop 10  
10. Expanding I-70 to ten lanes will obliterate fully a third of the homes in Elyria. 9. Expanding I-70 to ten lanes means denying Environmental Justice to the people of Globeville, Elyria and Swansea. 8. Expanding I-70 to ten lanes does nothing to address the damage already done to the neighborhoods by the original construction of I-70. 7. Expanding I-80 further destroys those neighborhoods and makes worse the lives of the people. 6. Expanding I-70 to ten lanes in reality means building two freeways: the existing six lanes plus another four unnecessary for-profit toll lanes (so-called Lexus Lanes) that benefits private companies at the public's expense. 5. Expanding I-70 to ten lanes will create even more air pollution, add more greenhouse gasses to the atmosphere and make climate change even worse. 4. Expanding I-70 to ten lanes applies 20th Century thinking to 21st Century transportation needs. 3. Expanding I-70 to ten lanes means making the negative health consequences in these neighborhoods - already the worst in the city - even more deadly. 2. Expanding I-70 to ten lanes means disregarding all current transportation models, statistics and needs and relies on out-dated, eleven-year old data. 1. Expanding I-70 to ten lanes is a Billion Dollar Boondoggle that Colorado taxpayers can't afford.

I am excited by and supportive of the plan proposed by "Unite North Metro Denver" group to divert I-70 between Wadsworth and Central Park Blvd, N to I-270/I-76. What an amazing opportunity is before us to reimagine our city and repair the harm done to the Swansea, Alyria, and Globeville communities as well as the vivisection of Rock Mountain Lake Park area of Northwest Denver. Not only is living next to or near a highway harmful to health, but there are obvious safety, noise and quality of life issues that abound. It's a wonderful opportunity to re-establish the continuity of neighborhoods, create walkable areas once again filled with small businesses, which would spur economic development in a way that looks to the future, when cars will no longer be our dominant mode of transport. San Francisco and Milwaukee Wisconsin offer valuable prototypes. We should look at the examples they've set closely, and move with deliberation and thoughtfulness for the quality of health, sustainability and community of Denver's citizens. I do hope CDOT will return to the drawing board with a serious look toward the plan offered up by Unite North Metro Denver.

This project would be o.k. if \$ were not an issue. But if CDOT has an extra \$1.8B please spend it on I-70 to & from the mountains here it is needed. If the viaduct needs fixing - Fix it. Spend \$ where it is needed!

I think that the most feasible alternative to lowering I-70 at it's existing site is too costly. Adding lanes will require property acquisitions that will further impact the affected neighborhoods and just moves the noise, air pollution, and truck traffic. When traffic jams occur via congestion or by accidents, and we know they will happen and frequently, the poor people sitting in these jams will be breathing condensed pollution as it sits in the hole that's built. The best alternative is the loop around these neighborhoods. It will be much cheaper in the long run, both by initial construction and by future maintenance requirements.

I have concerns about the proposed I-70 changes & specifically I am concerned about the plan to move the highway below ground & widen it. The environmental & financial costs of digging in this area are unknown. Doing this in any area is inappropriate. Doing it in a low income neighborhood and near an elementary school is unethical and unsafe. Clearly widening of the highway will bring the temporary as well as long term impact of noise, trucks, air pollution and property impacts. My family & I live just East of Federal Blvd & 3 blocks North of I-70. In time my neighborhood will be impacted by the bottle necking that will occur. A less expensive, less environmentally impactfull option would be to reroute I-70 North, to I270 & I76. Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Hello, I am opposed to rebuilding I70 through Denver. This is the age of new urbanism. Denver is a vibrant city and needs to progressively rebuild the Swansea, Elyria and Globeville neighborhoods. A major freeway bisecting the city was a mistake 50 years ago and now is the time to remedy it. It is a waste of money to rebuild I70. Money would be much better spent rerouting the traffic to 270 and I76. The historic inner city would be revitalized, property values would sky rocket. I70 is a major polluter. There are many elementary schools near I70 where children are being gassed with fumes from automobiles every day. Look at cities like San Francisco and Milwaukee, besides others, where freeways have been removed with quite positive results for the cities. Denver would be far better off and would move forward in greatness with I70 being removed, rather than rebuilt.

I have reviewed the I-70 East Project Snapshot released by two CDOT representatives at the presentation entitled "I-70. Thinking Outside the Freeway" at the Brown Palace Hotel today, and read much of the I-70 East Supplemental Draft EIS released August 29, 2014. One thing I've learned as a physician for 40 years is that if one says something in an authoritative fashion, others tend to believe it, especially if the one saying it has the most power. That does not make it true. I attended the presentation today at the Brown Palace Hotel, sponsored by the City Club of Denver. I was quite impressed by the knowledge, professionalism and insight of both speakers, Dean Foreman and Dennis Royers, both of whom expressed significant concerns about the expansion of I-70. I don't believe these concerns have been adequately answered in the SDEIS or "Project Snapshot". It makes sense to me that adding four "managed" (toll) lanes will not adequately alleviate traffic volumes in the six general purpose lanes. It has been reported that those whose incomes are less than \$75,000 annually do not use the toll lanes. Continuing with six general purpose lanes does not handle the increased traffic which does not use the toll lanes. There are no details explaining how the four extra toll lanes will integrate into the I-25/70 "mousetrap". Is it true that models usually (70%) overestimate the true amount of traffic which occurs, as Mr. Royers stated? CDOT reports that the cost of widening I-70 will be \$1.8 billion. I believe \$850 million will be taken from the Bridge Enterprise Fund. I believe this fund accumulates \$100 million per year. So that means there would be no funding for bridge repairs for 8.5 years. Does this mean there will be no bridge repairs for 8.5 years, or will taxes be increased to replace this money? CDOT reports that "53 residences and 21 businesses will be acquired by the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative. CDOT will follow all federal and state regulations that require payment for properties based on fair market value and for the relocation of residents displaced by the project". This is the state using eminent domain to move businesses away from their clientele and residents away from their relatives and friends. Let's estimate that four people live in each residence and each business employs four people. That would mean forcibly moving 256 people away from their support systems. This will be especially difficult for low-income residents who may have difficulty speaking English. Where will they find housing and business locations as affordable as they currently have? The "loop option", using I-270/76, could be renovated without destroying 53 residences and 21 businesses, and could be done while I-70 remains fully operational, eliminating the five year construction delays, detours and traffic jams. The I-270/76 loop option currently has an existing right of way wide enough for a 10 lane highway. It needs no additional construction, such as a tunnel or park space since there is little neighborhood housing and no schools to be disturbed by traffic noise or air pollution. The "loop option" renovation would be significantly less costly than \$1.8 billion. I have read the article by Laurie Dunklee in the North Denver Tribune, published on October 1, 2014. This documents numerous points refuting the information in the SDEIS released by CDOT. Therefore, I would strongly oppose proceeding with the I-70 widening proposal.

To Whom It May Concern: I oppose the preferred alternative that CDOT has presented for expanding I-70 to 10 lanes. It's a losing situation for everyone except for those who want to get from the mountains to the airport quickly, which does not benefit Denver. As a Denverite, I do not support this misuse of our neighborhoods and city. I do not support the destruction of homes and businesses that provide tax income to the City. I do not support destroying one of the few affordable housing stocks left in Denver. I support a plan that would reroute traffic along I-270 and over to I-76. CDOT already owns the right of way and would not have to destroy any homes or businesses to do this. The existing portion of I-70, as the gateway to our beautiful downtown, should be turned into a striking boulevard. Not only will this not destroy tax providing properties, it would create new ones. It would allow the stock show to expand, ensuring that it will stay in Denver. The current proposed plan is short sighted and simply wrong for Denver.

It appears there is a way better option, but politics is taking-hold and allowing a private company's interest in front of the public's interests. US 36, an international company will likely be getting a long-term contract for the new proposed toll. No one is suggesting that there is not an issue on I-70, but there is likely a better way to solve the problem. Please just study this option. Re-routing I-70 onto a widened/improved I-270/I-76 appears that it would address I-70's traffic congestion on each side of I-25 for half the cost. The non-local traffic would drive a little further but get there faster with less fuel, avoiding the "tunnel" CDOT is about to create. The current six lanes of I-70 would stay as six lanes but as a Wadsworth type boulevard, which should handle traffic better. In total, this would allow for 12 I-70 bordering neighborhoods to be cleaner and safer while rejuvenating some economic/development opps for many sections of undeveloped/weak areas of Adams County. This seems so obvious. Thank you for listening.

I wonder if this message will be read. I see the pending bottleneck between Pecos and Wadsworth when the highway has an expanded capacity on both the west and east of this section. I don't understand why the full route utilizing 270 and 76 was not considered, why trenching the highway, disrupting neighborhoods, running hazardous materials through our school zones, increased cost, impact to the S. Platte basin, land ownership and cost were all overlooked so that the current plan of widening I-70 in place could be pushed on Denver residents. There is a better option, claiming that it's too late is a lie, it's never too late to do the right thing. Please consider the impact to those of us who live in this city, there are better options, let's look at them with an honest eye. Thank you

Rerouting I-70 onto I-270 and I-76 will solve the problems created by the proposed expansion of I-70.

This is a terrible idea and will likely mean expanding west of federal next.

As a home owner with plans of starting a family in the Cole neighborhood, the potential environmental and air quality consequences could force us from our home. I am fully aware that my home rests on a Superfund site that underwent topsoil remediation in the 90s, but this project would disrupt literally tons of below grade contaminated soils filling the air we breathe with harmful toxins. My house is in the Cole neighborhood where we consistently are able to smell the dog food factory, so there is no doubt in my mind that the contaminated soils from the I-70 excavation would be make it to my house. Not to mention a lifetime pollution from the increase in traffic after the project. This proposal is downright irresponsible and is putting an entire community's physical health at risk.

Having lived in the Denver metro area since 1984 I have seen countless local, county and state highway projects built in and around the city and beyond. I believe that CDOT, as well as the various local government agencies, have done a very good job of providing transportation facilities that have responded to Denver's, and regional, population and traffic growth. Some notable projects include I-76 from I-25 to I-70, C-470/E-470, TRECX I-25, Twin Tunnels and RTD's light rail system. I didn't live in Colorado when I-70 was originally built bisecting north Denver and the northern suburbs, but that has never made any sense to me. Why would an interstate be planned and built in such a location? Things were a lot different then of course but now we have an opportunity to correct what has been proven to be a bad idea. When I heard about the I-70 East Expansion project I was honestly SHOCKED. Many aspects about this project WORRY ME: - The potential groundwater issues associated with building I-70 East below grade potentially harming the existing neighborhoods to the south. - Additional separation of neighborhoods. A 4-acre park is approximately a 400 foot by 400 foot area. Can this "park" really connect two neighborhoods? - Additional air pollution and noise pollution within neighborhoods. So many studies have been done and recognized regarding pollution and childhood development and health that it's hard to count. - Wider and wider highways. Yes, we need to accommodate more traffic, but at what environmental, social and economic costs? Once these facilities are built it seems these impacts are always forgotten under the guise of "progress". - Since the I-70 East Expansion project would not continue on to the west, there will be a bottleneck causing enormous traffic problems. Go to I-70 and Ward Road during afternoon rush hour where I-70 reduces down one lane and imagine that at I-25 and I-70, but on a much, much larger scale and more often, perhaps constantly. - Vehicles are now traveling under a posted 65 MPH speed limit where just a couple years ago the speed limit through town was 55. We all can attest to the impacts this has had already on public safety. - More toll lanes. I understand the concept, but the existing toll lanes around the city appear to be extremely underutilized for the amount of real estate they occupy. These toll lanes are very expensive to build. Do they really pay for themselves? Do they really lessen traffic? I'm not convinced, but they do allow for wonderful and safer traffic ticketing opportunities. - Construction of very excessive, partially below grade infrastructure that will require very expensive maintenance in the future. These publicly owned facilities typically have a life span of about 50 years. Imagine Denver in 50 years and the enormous challenges associated with maintenance and/or replacement. Not a pretty picture. THE I-270/I-76 ALTERNATIVE REALLY MAKES A LOT OF SENSE. This is a golden opportunity to correct mistakes made in the past. Let's take advantage and do the right thing for the people. - A new gateway will be possible leading into downtown from Denver International Airport. Massive economic growth potential will then exist in this area and neighborhoods can be TRULY UNITED, AT GROUND LEVEL. - I-270/I-76 will need to be rebuilt/expanded soon anyway due to age, deferred maintenance, decreased traffic capacity and regional population growth. - Literally no to almost no impacts to existing neighborhoods. - The "mousetrap" will be located farther north from downtown, alleviating congestion for miles north and south of downtown. - Alternative modes of transportation, such as bicycles, can be promoted, rather than forgotten about. I strongly urge CDOT and local government officials agencies to take another look at the I-270/I-76 Alternative and study all social, environmental and economic impacts at a much deeper level. Let's not make an age old mistake even worse.

The selected alternative is Not the right solution. I-70 needs to be rebuilt as it currently exist. The proposed options further cuts off access between neighborhoods for bike and pedestrians a key issue. As the new ped bridges will not be sufficient and further cause these neighborhoods to be car dependant and further issues w health and quality of life issues that affect lower income neighborhoods.No matter how wide you make I-70 it will be congested just as I 25 is after t rex. This is not the right answer. Alternative modes need to be enhanced along the corridor. Quality of life and social justice for the neighborhoods along the corridor are critical. Do not widen I 70 it does nothing to deal w the issue.

I have lived in Denver for 10 years and lived in the Cole neighborhood for 3.5 of them. It is vitally important that the air quality of the neighborhoods along I-70 East should be considered above all else in this project. There are already elevated rates of asthma, especially among children, in the communities along this corridor. Thank you for taking this into consideration.

This proposal for an expanded freeway is insanity at it's worst. If more mass transit is built and the alternative plan were to be developed....76 etc. this monster would not be needed. this city has already been cut up by two major freeways over the years at a great cost to the adjacent neighborhoods; I for one can't imagine putting more capacity through this corridor. THIS IS TO FEED THE DEVELOPERS ROAD CAPACITY, PLAIN AND SIMPLE.Denver cannot go west anymore so it must go east, 470 was built to serve the developers north and south...when is this major freeway development/building going to end before Denver is just another L.A.? The noise levels through this corridor are already unacceptable! Why do they not build these roads below grade? With a Swiss like train system, Colorado/Denver would not need another major expensive highway to maintain, one that would be outdated in 15 years time anyway. the only viable solution is mass transit and another east west alternative. CDOT IS CORRUPT, THE POLITICIANS ARE ALL CORRUPT!DENVER DESERVES BETTER!!!!

As a resident of the Berkeley neighborhood, I want to go on record that I do not support the proposed abandonment and rerouting of I-70 that many in my neighborhood are pushing. Using any additional resources to explore this ridiculous and infeasible option would be a tremendous waste of funding. Although the limits of this project are outside our immediate area, I believe that the efforts of my neighborhood would be much better focused on ensuring that the highway can better fit within the fabric of the neighborhood. Things sound walls, additional pedestrian crossings and improved landscaping would benefit the neighborhood without abandoning the current alignment

Last night I attended a meeting where a member of the Denver city council gave a presentation of the proposed widening and modification of I-70 to the public. It was held at the Bruce Randolph Middle School at 40th Ave and Vasquez Blvd. The proposed modification consisted of lowering the road below grade, widening it to 10 lanes, two of which will be tolled, and covering it with an above grade park. It also included cutting off York St and building "slip ramps" at Vasquez Blvd and other streets that I cannot recall. Much traffic will be routed onto Colorado Blvd to gain access to I-70.

1. I learned that the length of the park would be approximately 600 ft long, and the footprint of the road would be expanded from 117 ft to 175 ft. With 10 lanes of traffic including large trucks, I asked how the exhaust gases would be ventilated. The answer was "There isn't any ventilation system - the length of the park is short enough to make a ventilation system unnecessary". Since this would release exhaust gases to the neighboring residences and schools, I disagree.
2. How far below grade will the road be to accommodate large vehicles? If the metro area should be subjected to a 1" or more rain storm, where would the water go? How would you keep the trench (which would be the low elevation point) from flooding? Would winter slush turn to shade protected ice under the park?
3. I was informed that the soil under the road is contaminated with heavy metals; where would you put the thousands of cubic yards of contaminated soil as the trench is dug? How would you prevent dust float during transportation?
4. Colorado Blvd is already congested at rush hour, what will happen after more traffic is routed to Colorado Blvd to gain access to I-70?
5. Many accidents happen when motorists attempt to change lanes. If a motorist is in the extreme left non-tolled lane, that motorist have to make at least three lane changes to reach an exit.
6. I was informed by some attendees that the alternative northern route (rejected as too costly by CDOT) would actually cost much less the \$1.8 billion (initial estimate?) alternative chosen by CDOT, and would displace fewer residences and businesses. CDOT was not there to respond.
7. No one at the meeting was certain how this project will be funded since the Federal Government claims this to be a local or state responsibility. Also, we could not get clear answers as to what agency will fund the continuing maintenance of the superstructure as well as the highway.
8. To build the project as shown, a detour would be necessary; however it was not clear where the detour would start and where it would end. At the meeting we were told that it would go up to I-270. Would you need a detour if the northern alternative were chosen? What would be the cost of the detour if the detour itself were the new I-70?
9. Some attendees at the meeting noted that passenger auto traffic on I-70 may not increase as anticipated since some millennials and seniors are choosing to not drive and take public transportation when possible - so increasing the highway to 10 lanes may not be necessary.
10. The dual purposes of the project was to (a) reduce congestion and (b) improve the mobility and accessibility for residents of the Elyria-Swansea and Globeville neighborhoods. It seems that this project will not necessarily reduce congestion, will adversely affect the environment and will do the opposite of its intended second objective.
11. At the beginning of the presentation, the first slide indicated that the I-70 modification would extend eastward to Tower road. The eastern section of the project was not discussed since no one from CDOT was at the meeting to discuss it.

In conclusion - Do not proceed with this project as presented and reconsider the northern alternative with a realistic cost estimate!! Also, open CDOT meetings to the public in a location where those most affected by the project can conveniently attend.

PS It occurred to me after the meeting that if the project had been completed as planned, my wife and I would have had to take a different route home because we would not have been able to go east bound on I-70 from Vasquez Blvd.

To whom it may concern,

My wife and I bought a house in the rapidly evolving Chaffee Park Neighborhood 3 years ago. We are excited to live near downtown Denver. We have been closely following the proposal to update the dated I-70 viaduct for quite some time now. I know CDOT has spent considerable time looking into options for the best course of action. I am very distraught that our own state DOT has been quick to dismiss the one alternative that has gained the most support among the communities that will be most impacted by this project.

A reroute of I-70 around Denver is by far the most popular option to put more time and energy into investigating. While I don't have hard numbers in front of me, I find it very hard to believe that the scope of work is so much more than the proposed option of lowering and widening I-70 in its existing location. The areas immediately adjacent to the proposed \*reroute\* corridor are for the most part wide open and/or surrounded by industrial property that could easily be absorbed to add width to the existing roadway.

I'm scratching my head about how the reroute could cost an estimated \$4B when the entire US36 project from Denver to Boulder is a measly \$500M. The absurdly high numbers for a proposed reroute simply don't make sense. I would be interested in seeing hard figures that were developed to see where the additional costs come from. In the meantime, I sincerely hope that CDOT will put the brakes on moving forward with the existing recommendation until further investigation of the popular alternative can be conducted.

In closing, I will say that I appreciate all the work that has gone into fixing a problem that needs dire attention. I would hope the health of our city and the needs of our communities will come before the need to add more capacity for vehicles. Our city in particular and the younger generation is moving toward less traffic and closer knit pedestrian and bike friendly communities. Expanding the interstate right through the middle of Denver is a step in the wrong direction. Period. Thanks very much for your time and I look forward to hearing about how we can work to find a viable alternative together.

Please do not expand I70. Remove it, put in a Blvd and reroute it to I76 and I270

Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative, Property Impacts, Swansea Elementary, Truck Traffic comments: I believe that, although the proposed alternative is genuinely considered to be an improvement to the local neighborhoods impacted, it is not good enough. These neighborhoods deserve an alternative such as moving I-70 through Swansea-Elyria to the I-76 route, and restoring the neighborhoods to a liveable habitat.

I am in opposition to the expansion of I 70. Supporter of the reroute and install the Blvd.

The evidence against the proposed plan to widen I 70 in North Denver is too clear to be ignored. Please make the right decision and do not go forward with the proposed plan.

I don't want a bigger highway that will increase traffic and decrease property sustainability.

Denver is growing and will continue growing, So, it needs at least two major highways going N-S and two major highs going E-W. interconnected by auxiliary links. The I-70 even that will be widened, will not solve the problem of traffic jams.

The DU Iliff School of Theology leaders said it best: "We request that the Colorado Department of Transportation develop a solution that listens to the needs and wants of those who live in these neighborhoods. We seek an outcome that does not displace homes, families, or businesses in these neighborhoods. We seek a solution that demonstrably improves the health and wellness of residents beyond conditions that exist today that is, a solution that results in measurably better health conditions for residents, school children, workers and visitors to these neighborhoods. We request a solution that improves mobility and accessibility of residents of these neighborhoods, that does not continue to rely on fossil fuel technology, and provides instead new investments in transit, sidewalk completion, separation of railways, and bicycle connections. We request a solution that focuses foremost on improved connectivity within these neighborhoods and repairing the damage caused by locating I-70 here more than 50 years ago." Please.

I used to live in Dallas, Texas for twenty years and had watched Texas Department of Transportation rebuild many highways and interchanges in Dallas as well as other cities, namely Fort Worth and Houston. One feature that I loved so much is 'Texas U-Turn' or 'Texas Turnaround', which is effectively one lane frontage road built on each side of intersecting street. This feature allows the drivers turn left twice onto the opposite frontage road without waiting for traffic lights. This is as to access the business on opposite side of the highway.

I have had family living in the Globeville area since 1888. I myself attended school in Globeville in the late 1950s when I-70 was originally built. The Eliria, Swansea and Globeville neighborhoods were decimated at that time. Plans as stated to replace the current elevated portion of I-70 with a trench 10 lanes wide will put the final nails in the coffin of Eliria and Swansea. This plan is the very definition of Social Injustice: demolishing 53 more homes and 20 businesses to add four "Lexus lanes" so the wealthy, who can afford to pay the tolls, can get through Denver a bit faster. Where are the 53 families now living in those homes going to go? Most of those folks are low-income. The average value of those homes is less than \$200,000. With average home prices in the Denver region exceeding \$250,000, what can those families buy to replace the homes they would be losing? Average apartment rents in Denver exceed \$1,100 per month and the vacancy rate is below 3.9 percent. What could they rent, if they could find an apartment, that would be affordable? CDOT says this plan will improve connectivity in the area. After five years of demolition, excavation and reconstruction, there won't be a neighborhood left on the north side of the highway to worry about connecting. Residents not bought out will have been driven out. Other cities have bypasses around the urban core - Kansas City for one, and it's on I-70. Other cities have even eliminated freeways through their urban cores - Minneapolis and San Francisco, for example - and the city environments are the better for it. I, for one, do not accept CDOT's statement that the Loop I-270/I-76 alternative will cost over \$4 billion. CDOT is projecting the cost to build a completely new highway starting from scratch. Existing highway right-of-way already exists for the Loop I-270/I-76 alternative, some roadway already exists, and semis carrying hazardous cargos already divert off of I-70 and onto the 270/I-76 route around the urban core and "mousetrap." This route adds a mere 2.2 miles to the route through the city. No connectivity amenities such as trench, tunnel and park space are needed and very few residences or commercial areas would be disturbed by the project.

I am a registered Architect. I have lived and practiced in metro Denver and environs since 1971, and have used I70 through Denver all that time. Today I read about Unite North Metro Denver (UNMD) in the Denver Post, and subsequently on their web site <http://unitenorthmetrodenver.com>. The UMND suggestions parallel almost exactly my own thoughts developed independently and I am now a wholehearted supporter of routing a new I70 along the right-of-way of I76 and I270 as they suggest. Rather than reiterate their concept, I urge CDOT to dust off their earlier study of this alignment. Even though the UMND concept would cost more overall, it could be phased over a longer period of time. My phasing would start with the rebuilding of the affected sections of I76 and I270, making them suitable for the future I70. Phase 2 would be the removal of the old I70 viaduct and reconstruction of the street beneath as an on-grade "business route" feeder connecting each end of the severed viaduct from the mousetrap to Quebec St. and to Brighton Blvd and the arena/Stockyard complex as currently proposed. Connections to Canam Hwy, Colorado Blvd, and Quebec would all be on grade intersections. E 56th Ave could be expanded to Pena Blvd. Finally, I believe if such massive reconstruction is going to be undertaken at all, it should be according to the plan most capable of making things better for all the residents, businesses, civic entities, and through travelers. The cost of doing this work can be spread over many years, and should not be the highest priority therefore precluding a better plan. Thanks for listening

#### MY COMMENT ON THE I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

I've read the above captioned Supplemental Draft and there are a couple of Findings which I found alarming:

1. Approximately 20% of all daily traffic on this corridor (Tower Rd. to the Mousetrap) is Heavy Vehicle Traffic.
2. Nearly 1,000 vehicle CRASHES occur on this corridor Annually, many resulting in serious bodily injuries and fatalities.

The Supplemental Draft notes that heavy vehicles contribute to traffic congestion and bottlenecks due to their slower acceleration speed, thus impeding traffic flow. And a representative of Denver Traffic Engineering testified at the Oct. 22, 2014 public meeting sponsored by Councilwoman Ortega that this heavy vehicle traffic is largely responsible for the high number of crashes and delays. At the same public meeting, Councilwoman Ortega stated that the City is opposed to running heavy vehicle traffic through the tunnel that is being proposed by CDOT. She also said that a way must be found to route heavy vehicle traffic onto I-270 and I-276, from I-70. As a resident of Green Valley Ranch who commutes daily from Tower Road via I-70 and then via Brighton Blvd. into downtown where I work, I can attest to the extreme safety hazards I encounter during my daily commute. As traffic abruptly slows in one lane, drivers who find themselves behind tall, heavy rigs, dart into adjoining lanes of traffic at high rates of speed hoping to avoid the slowdown. They cannot see that the other lane is also slowing up ahead, oftentimes forcing them to slam on their breaks. Abruptly switching lanes combined with no visibility leads to numerous crashes. The solution I see is to either ban heavy rigs from rush hour traffic altogether along this corridor, or route them onto I-270 and I-276 as Councilwoman Ortega suggests. Simply creating more lanes and upgrading entrance and exit ramps along the I-70 East corridor would seem to invite even more heavy vehicle traffic.

Lost in the discussion as to why most big rigs choose not to exit onto I-270 from I-70 in the first place is the constricted nature of I-270, coupled with a limited number of exits from I-270. This issue needs to be addressed before spending massive sums of money expanding I-70 East.

I am opposed to CDOT's proposal for a partially covered below grade highway to replace the I-70 viaduct for several reasons that are listed below. Although this proposal has been approved by the Denver City Council, their approval was sought and given before many questions and concerns had been identified. Because of the expense of this proposal, spanning a period of 35 years under a public private partnership, I believe that the Supplemental EIS should not be submitted until after the municipal election in May when these same questions and concerns have been more thoroughly dealt with by CDOT and submitted to the incoming City Council for approval. The CDOT approval would require the destruction of housing that is in very short supply at this time and do very little if anything to reunite neighborhoods. If the viaduct is replaced by a street, with the original street grid restored, the area would attract residential development, retail businesses and grocery stores that is, the basics for restoring thriving neighborhoods. DRCOG's traffic predictions may be faulty. Although Denver's population has grown quickly and can be expected to continue to grow, that is also true of the country as a whole. In spite of rapid population growth nation-wide, driving has declined for the last nine years. With increasing concern about climate change and with the rapid growth of our public transportation there may soon be a similar decline in driving in the Denver metro area. The drainage system being proposed is long overdue, but there are concerns not about costs and also about adequacy in severe weather events. Vehicles, drivers and passengers trapped in the center of a very large drainage basin are likely to be endangered. CDOT has taken the position that no new taxes will be needed for the preferred option, implying that there are and will continue to be surplus funds available from existing resources that will not be needed for other purposes. That is questionable now, but even more questionable in anticipating the needs that may arise over the next thirty-five years of the anticipated public private partnership. Relocating people upends their day-to-day existence, their ability to get to their jobs, doctors, babysitters, schools and grocery stores, as well as their usual ways of saving money and making ends meet. To subject young children to a daily existence within a few yards of a highway will shorten their life spans, weaken their immune systems and subject them to illnesses. With the viaduct, gas fumes could blow out across open spaces, with a below-grade highway they will float up into classrooms and any other areas in the vicinity. The impacts on human beings are predictable and extremely serious.

I was a Denver resident for my first forty years, so I feel compelled to comment on the proposed preferred plan for I-70 in east Denver. In none of the articles I have read or newscasts I have seen has anyone mentioned the fact that the previous covered portion of I-70 out near what was Stapleton Airport was removed because of the dangerous conditions it presented for drivers.

I encourage CDOT to explore an alternative to expanding I70 - move the freeway onto the I-76 and I-270 routes. I70 currently runs through a number of historic neighborhoods that are populated by children. Increasing the number of lanes on I70 would force the destruction of historic homes, reduce property values, and increase the damage to existing homes from pollution. It would also increase the amount of exposure for children and their families who live in the neighborhoods along I70. I76 and I270 do not pass through such populated areas, and the impact of the increased pollution, noise and hazardous materials will be less that it would along I70. It would be very irresponsible for CDOT to not explore these alternatives.

Absolutely opposed to the current plan. We do not need to increase highway size or volume. We need to take this back to the community and come up with some alternatives to this plan( I.e. more public transport, another highway around the city, etc.)

The PCLA offers a balance between an efficient route for travelers and a design that reduces impact (where it can) for the surrounding neighborhoods... ultimately the highway is a necessary utility so the discussion should involve how the highway is designed and not whether it should exist or not. I'd love to see from my front porch a wall of murals where I use to see an ugly, dangerous loud viaduct. Also a planted forest on the cap that provides habitat, food, and instruction. Thanks!

just for the record, cdot has always been available for questions for anyone that had them...but if you have meetings independent of the structured EIS process wherein individuals are lecturing rather than discussing...then their questions aren't going to get answered

Please reconsider this "improvement" which only appears to make matters worse. The expansion is costly and ignores the impact to our community as well as ignores a simple alternative of re-routing traffic through I-270 and I-76. If this is not the next option for the communities being impacted or commuters, who is it serving?

I would love to be enlightened to the reason that Denver, a city we proclaim to be progressive and in tune with nature and our environment would proceed with a project such as this. Do we honestly believe that simply widening an interstate by displacing thousands is the sustainable answer that we are waiting for? We are looked at as a progressive city, constantly evolving to develop our city but never at the costs of the environment or the most susceptible and vulnerable. When the city keeps expanding, will we just keep widening the lanes until we are Los Angeles. We are not Los Angeles, we are Denver. Although your aim is to further economic development by allowing people to move freely with out traffic, at what cost? I have met people in the neighborhood who have never received any information in Spanish. These are marginalized communities that are being taken advantage of to further big businesses who bring nothing into those communities besides pollution and noise. I would ask that you come up with a plan that is more aligned to what Denver strives for, sustainable 21st century development with the environment in mind, not a plan that makes us a mountain-filled California that preys on our most vulnerable, those with out a voice.

Re route to the north.open up the current area to development. Denver needs more space and these neighborhoods and denver would greatly benefit the redirect to I 76.The right of way and easements are much less detrimental on I 76.Other cities have had success with this as more and more people are choosing to live closer to the urban core.Current widening plan is ugly,loud and a eyesore.It harms the current neighborhoods more when they should be revitalized and developed to meet housing demands.

To the overseers of the proposed I-70 project, I ask you....what is the rationale for this project? Is this a short sighted project that is being designed based on today's needs? Or have you designed this project with tomorrow's needs in mind? After all, this project is not expected to be completed for at least 10 years. There have been numerous studies conducted and articles written about the fact that millenials are purchasing fewer cars and driving less. Additionally, we see an increasing demand from existing and newer metro area residents to migrate into the city. They are moving to the city for convenience and the ability to walk or use other modes of transportation other than a car. We know that too that there is a finite supply of fossil fuels. With all of these realities in play, why would invest over a billion dollars in a highway that is unlikely to be used to capacity by the time it is completed? I have several other concerns about this project. They include: - Impact to the surrounding communities. Elyeria, Swansea and Globeville have been forced to sacrifice access to the city and quality of life for several decades. This project will further decimate the community by separating families (for those who lose their homes and/or businesses) and increase economic, health and quality of life burdens on these residents. - Health Impacts. Area residents and drivers on I-70 will be introduced to toxins that can lead to cancer and other life threatening illnesses. As I understand, the area for the proposed trench has not undergone any remediation from Asarco, in particular, but also from other area businesses. This project will disrupt toxic particles that have been dormant in the soil and have the likely potential to make the particles both airborne and to send them into our water supply and into the soil in the surrounding area. No one can guarantee that there will not be precipitation during the dig and therefore run off from rain or floods can send the toxins down stream to neighbors - Cost. We've not yet seen your plan for funding this project and particularly for the upkeep of the cover. The residents of Denver should not be burdened with the economic upkeep of this project which is a state highway rather than a city road. Accountability - You and your team, as a state employee are accountable to the residents of Colorado who pay your salary. I hope you will take your responsibility very seriously and consider and act upon the preferences of the residents. Expanding I-70 is NOT your sole option. This project can be moved a little further north, away from residential areas to minimize the health and community impacts. Additionally, because you will not need to dig a trench this project can be delivered in a much more cost effective manner. That is, if this project truly warrants such a large expansion for our future.

Please consider the alternative of re-routing I-70 to improve accessibility for communities near I-70 and to decrease pollution, and to minimize disruption to families and neighborhoods during construction. Re-routing is a better plan for Denver.

To Whom it May Concern, As an environmentalist, mother, and proud citizen of Denver and Colorado, I have serious concerns about the Colorado Department of Transportation's proposal to widen Interstate 70 in north Denver. It will completely devastate the mostly impoverished and Hispanic neighborhoods of Elyria-Swansea and Globeville between Colorado Boulevard and I-25. My concerns center on the health of all people in these areas, as well as the environmental injustice that is so evidently displayed. Widening Interstate 70 in this corridor will significantly increase the public health threat that the highway's presence already poses to residents in these neighborhoods, including several elementary schools. The current proposal will seriously fracture the cohesiveness of these neighborhoods. They just went through this 50 years ago and were torn apart, and now they are having to go through this again. This proposal of widening I-70 to more than 300 feet in width will remove the families living on 7 of 14 core blocks in Elyria displacing at least fifty families and will create further barriers between families and neighbors living north and south of the proposed expanded highway. Currently, there is no proposal for helping replace the housing stock that this project will remove with comparably priced housing in the same area. Displaced homeowners will not be equipped to find similar housing, and certainly not near the same neighborhood. This is a serious disruption of an already damaged social environment. This is completely stunning to me. I sincerely request that the Colorado Department of Transportation develop a solution that listens to the needs and wants of those who live in these neighborhoods. I seek an outcome that does not displace homes, families, or businesses in these neighborhoods. I seek a solution that demonstrably improves the health and wellness of residents beyond conditions that exist today that is, a solution that results in measurably better health conditions for residents, school children, workers and visitors to these neighborhoods. There is a better solution out there. I request a solution that focuses foremost on improved connectivity within these neighborhoods and repairing the damage caused by locating I-70 here more than 50 years ago. The whole is only as strong as the sum of its parts. I live in Northwest Denver - these are my neighbors and my fellow Coloradans. We must stand together and demand a better solution. Thank you for your time

With respect to the CDOT plan for replacing the eye 70 viaduct, I agree with the comments made by Thad Tecza and Frank Sullivan. Auditor Dennis Gallagher has also weighed in. If the CDOT plan is adopted as presently formulated, necessary projects in other parts of the state will lose funds. I may have filled in a similar comment earlier.

Re-route I-70 traffic along I-76 and 270. Lets keep traffic flowing by routing it North around Denver. At least improve this alternative route before the construction begins on I-70. This is common sense. Allow traffic to flow and allow people to get to their destinations quicker. In addition, building a highway in a trench is absurd. Please show some good judgment before wasting Denver's time and resource's in building a maintenance nightmare.

The existing route for I70 should remain where it is and NOT be changed. It seems that the people who are most in favor of re-routing I70 are those in a position to increase their financial gain. These would be the homeowners who have purchased property along the I70 corridor and could see their home prices rise if this proposal were to take effect. Additionally, I suspect that you will find development interests driving this proposal. Developers who are moving North out of Denver see this area as enticing if I70 were re-routed. If they have not already, they could start purchasing large tracts of land very cheap in order to maximize their gains. This is not an environmental issue or a neighborhood re-integration proposal. When I25 was expanded during the T-Rex project the Washington Park neighborhood emerged as vibrant as ever. The idea to re-route I70 around the city from it's current location is being driven by minority interests that stand to gain the most financially and not out of any practical idea for urban development.

I am opposed to the widening of I-70 for several reasons. 1. More lanes do not improve traffic appreciably. All these lanes will make traffic a LITTLE better but at HUGE cost financially, to businesses and homes that currently exist, extra noise and air pollution and dredging up toxic waste. 2. I feel that we cannot justify paying so much (and possibly more later) when the Preliminarily identified alternative on I-76 is much less expensive and much less problematic. 3. Huge highways tear up the fabric of neighborhood. I do not think that a few links with a park/playground renderings look deceptive to me. I have been in a park over a highway in Seattle and it is not as appealing as the sketch makes it look. The sketch does now show the sound impact, smell impact or the pollution that the children will inhale in such a location. 4. I am opposed to moving homes and businesses that are in the brink of thriving with our improving economy. It seems tragic to close these opportunities down. Please reconsider the Preliminarily Identified Alternative.

Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Swansea Elementary comments: An alternative MUST be reconsidered. The I-70 expansion proposal as-is has tremendously detrimental impacts to Denver neighborhoods. The fact is that these neighborhoods include higher populations of low-income and minority residents. All Denver residents deserve to breathe clean air. The structural and air quality impacts this project would have on these north Denver neighborhoods is unfair, unjust, and unconscionable.



Although I live in Park Hill, I have worked in various capacities with the Swansea, Globeville, Clayton and Cole immigrant communities for 17 years. Their issues are my issues. In my comments, I would like to highlight their concerns as many have relayed them to me. AIR QUALITY There should be regular air quality monitoring before, during and after construction. This is particularly important at Swansea School, but should not be limited to that site. Residents' property and common areas such as Swansea Park are also subject to air contamination. Funds should be provided to enable the community to hire their own independent air quality expert. Trees should be planted in as many places as possible, both public and private spaces. Some Swansea streets have lovely tree covers, others do not. Trees should be made provided in those areas. There should be extensive lead and arsenic sampling and remediation where required, whether in public or private space. The number of lanes between Colorado Blvd. and Brighton should be reduced to protect the community's space and to prevent bottlenecks at the points where the highway contracts. The interchange at Colorado Blvd. should be built in such a way as to replace the existing Colorado and Vasquez interchanges. Truck traffic should be diverted both on I-70 and in and around the neighborhoods, except when intended for local delivery and use. Improvements to doors and windows of homes and businesses impacted by the construction (within 500 feet) should be paid for by CDOT. This would replace the proposal of making loan funds available for this purpose. RELOCATION/HOUSING Relocation assistance should be given to residents who were not 500 feet from I-70 before the widening, but who become within that margin after the construction. The number of housing units lost (exact number is currently unknown) due to the construction should be replaced and expanded, as possible, within the neighborhood boundaries. Affordable homeownership options and affordable rental options should be maintained at current levels, and the ratio of single family detached homes should also be maintained. Grants should be provided to residents, particularly in Swansea and Elyria, living between 45th and 47th Avenues to equip their homes to handle the increased noise and air pollution during and after construction. AMENITIES Funding should be provided for the addition of both a regional recreation center and a community health center in Swansea-Elyria. Economic development should be undertaken to build out a shopping area that would include a full supermarket, a pharmacy, laundromat, cafe, etc. These neighborhoods post-construction should feel and look like they have been reintegrated into the historic Denver neighborhoods to the south. CONNECTIVITY Alternative routes should be developed for truck traffic during and after construction to keep trucks out of the neighborhoods. Traffic on neighborhood streets should be diverted during construction so that they are not used by non-residents as short cuts. Sidewalks and bike paths should be constructed to improve connectivity within the neighborhoods. ECONOMY Job training and apprenticeship programs, similar to those established for FasTracks, should be implemented. Hiring should prioritize applications made by local residents. Displaced businesses and those negatively impacted by the construction should be given appropriate and adequate support. Investment in supporting existing businesses and increasing their number should be an economic development priority. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE Mitigation to alleviate the negative environmental impacts should be paid for fully, regardless of the cost. These neighborhoods fought long and hard for past remediation. The success of these efforts must not be compromised. Money should be provided for the continued maintenance of all improvements made.

AS a long time resident ( before the original I-70 ) I believe the I-70 monster can not be stopped and as I am sorry to lose more and more of our little neighborhood, the channel would be the best option to go with. It would be a straight shot east to west and visa versa, BUT I am angry that C DOT is so blind as to think that a park over I-70 at a cost of more than \$150 million is a great idea. not only do we already have a park 2 blocks north, and another park 2 blocks south, THIS bridge will replace the accident prone Stapleton airport bridges which crossed I-70 between Quebec St. and Havana St. more and more accidents and deaths under there until they had to be demolished for safety sake.... I believe the money and concrete wasted on this PARK could be better used to connect every street north and south thru this corridor. A NEW 2 or 3 story school that can be built 2 blocks south 4400 Columbine a FULL city block owned free and clear by the City & County of Denver, @ a cost of only ONE & 1/2 million dollars would not only be far enough away that it would be 200% less pollution than keeping a ageing school that would need over 1 million dollars plus a PARK to help mitigate the over wellmiming pollution problems. If you think our neighborhood needs a NEW PARK build a new school elsewhere and you can build a PARK where the old school was. Please keep 46th ave a straight shot next to I-70 between Colo. Blvd. & Brighton Blvd. as to keep that over flow or accident avoiding traffic next to I-70. If you want to run an access road thru Swansea & Elyria use 48th ave, as it goes straight from Colo. Blvd. to 1 block away from the new light rail station to be built at 49th and Brighton Blvd. ( even thru Eaton Metal's yard ) and this won't split our neighborhoods in 1/2 again. I believe this Park is a way to show the nation how forward thinking Denver is, but it nwill only prove how backwards we are. I only hope that all the supporters of this new PARK will have their names on it so that everyone will know who is responsible for their loved ones injury or death under this PARK, and all the health problems, and accidents the kids going to the old school 1/2 a block away WILL experience. Build it right and build it for 2100 not for 2002 GOOD LUCK Swansea, Elyria, Denver

I have great concerns about closing the exit at York St. That is such a main way of getting to several of Denver's favorite attractions. I don't think this has been thought through.

I strongly oppose!

Widening I-70 to ten lanes through north Denver will exacerbate the air quality, already detrimentally affecting the people in the I-70 corridor. Instead of focusing on changing the traffic model with a vision for the future, it invests in and reverts to old traffic models of a decade earlier.

The I-70 expansion is indeed a "boondoggle" as expressed by Dennis Gallagher in the Park Hill News in October. At a time when alternative transportation should be receiving emphasis and funding, building a mega-highway that bisects Denver is wrong on nearly every level. A fraction of the 1.8 billion could be used to provide sidewalks in parts of Denver that are hostile to pedestrians, safe crossings for pedestrians and school children, bike lanes, separate bike paths, and policy that encourages alternative transportation. As Los Angeles, Atlanta, Dallas, and other large cities in America have proven, traffic cannot be out-built with wider roads. This expansion of I-70 is at the wrong time, done in the wrong way, and will be viewed in 20 years as shortsighted, wasteful, and the wrong path. Denver needs a smart plan for traffic. This is not it.

I've been in Elyria neighborhood 43 years and want to make sure this change will impact us in a positive way for many years to come. I am concerned about the traffic pollution, noise, and property impacts.

How long is the project? The Executive Summary does not say, and there is no scale on Exhibit ES-1. By researching the mileposts of the project limits myself, I estimate that the project is approximately 12 miles long. This number is found in later chapters but is not clearly identified as the length of the project.

How much will the project cost? There is no cost information in the Executive Summary. A table in Chapter 3 estimates the cost of managed lanes would be \$1.6 to \$1.8 billion. This sounds like an important fact that should appear in the Executive Summary. What good is the 21-page Executive Summary full of yada-yada-yada if it fails to disclose the project length and cost?

Air Quality, Financing, Hazardous Materials, Noise, Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative, Property Impacts, Swansea Elementary comments: Please listen to the public and do a SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. You already own the property necessary to widen these roads without damaging anymore in town neighborhoods and taking possession of tax payer homes. This alternative has proven itself to be much more cost effective and better for the environment.

Respect the children and families that would be affected by widening the highway near important elementary schools. Bussing students to different schools for five years is a terrible plan and erodes the community. The information you have provided regarding the expansion of I-70 does not address the toxic materials, like arsenic and lead, that you will be digging up in the Superfund site. How will you protect those families living close to I-70 from the toxic dust? This is not addressed in your plan nor has this issue been communicated to the public. It will also be very difficult and expensive to maintain the lower highway so that it will be safe during winter. How will you possibly widen I-70 to I-25 and not need to widen it further west causing more damage to the Sunnyside and Berkley-Regis neighborhoods in the future. Please do not split Denver more than it already has been by I-70 but have the foresight to bring Denver back together by rerouting the highway to I-76.

I am not in support of what is being presented at this point. Does this section of I-70 need work? Yes, it does however not to the extent of what is being proposed. Too many homes will be permanently gone due to this expansion. These neighborhoods have already had & experience the feeling of being forgotten & stepped on. By doing this they are going to experience the same thing all over again. There are unknowns when it comes to the contaminated soil from the Asarco plant that was once there in that area. Disrupting the soil can/will cause a lot of issues for the immediate area and beyond. CDOT already owns the proper space along I-270 to re-route the expansion. I feel strongly that this option should be considered more. CDOT will not disrupt homes or businesses by doing this. Please do not bully our neighborhoods anymore.

You are destroying 13 historic properties with what seems to be an absolute care a less attitude to the cultural significance of the neighborhoods that you are blowing through. The reroute through I-270/76 does not damage historic properties. Please do the least damage. You have charted a course to the maximum damage to the most amount of people. Government is not supposed to be this callous. Reroute your highway for the best of Colorado and not a Wall Street bank. Enough!

Why hasn't a basic fuel study been done to be compared to the reroute to I-270/76 idea? It seems logical to assume that truck time and therefore fuel use would be reduced with a quicker access to a boulevard. Why was this not studied? It needs to be studied. Fuel use and efficiency are to important not to be overlooked. Stop overlooking it.

Rerouting I-70 while leaving 46th Avenue at its current location encourages highway users to use 46th Avenue to reach their destinations rather than staying on I-70. GOOD! Because of this, there will be a substantial increase in traffic volumes on 46th Avenue, which introduces safety, access, and mobility issues in the surrounding neighborhoods and also creates a barrier for bicyclists and pedestrians moving through the community. Easily solved problems and much less expense than what you plan to destroy! Based on the traffic analysis, traffic volumes forecasted for 2035 on 46th Avenue if I-70 were to be rerouted will be 10 to 20 times higher (more than 50,000 vehicles per day) than the traffic forecasted for 46th Avenue with the alternatives that leave the highway at its current location. That is what a commercial boulevard is supposed to be like. Is this an attempt at a fearmonger tactic? i. Rerouting I-70 also will force delivery trucks and other large vehicles to use 46th Avenue frequently to reach the industrial areas and businesses located near the existing I-70. Which logic states that less time and therefore fuel would be used. This is a benefit to trucking to have a boulevard instead of a difficult to maneuver I-70. Will you people think about what is best for the state instead of a few people's wallets? Awful propaganda!

There will be an increase in out-of-direction travel, causing mobility issues. Of the traffic heading west on I-70, 50 to 60%, continues past I-25 staying on I-70. The reroute adds 2 miles in out-of direction travel for these vehicles. The remaining 25 percent to 30 percent of traffic heading west on I-70 exits to southbound I-25. This alternative adds four miles of out-of- direction travel for these vehicles. But its faster and safer for vehicles than what is there now or your plan. This reduces fuel, time, and environmental problems. Your excuses are too shallow. There will no longer be multiple east-west highway route choices in the area. The multiple route choices are beneficial for emergency access. YES there are. 470 is an option. Why are you encouraging truck through traffic to go through neighborhoods? This alternative requires more than 12 miles of major highway widening along I-270 and I-76. This increases the project construction cost to approximately \$3.5 to \$4 billion, which is twice as much as existing alignment alternatives. Its necessary to do this NOW! Delaying it only adds to traffic stifling, which has many costs and additional costs later. Please explain why a widening cost that you say is twice as much as a tunnel project? CDOT makes no sense.

I live Denver's Highland Park neighborhood and use I-70 frequently to drive to DIA or the mountains or to meetings on the north central or northeast side of town. I have reviewed the proposed I-70 East expansion plan and cringe at the thought of the traffic nightmare that the submerged highway section could become, especially in the winter months during subfreezing temperatures when ice will form and be slow to melt. Will this section be safe for motorcycles during winter months? I think not. I ride a motorcycle year-round, weather permitting, but I would think twice before venturing into this subterranean section. I anticipate it would be called the "ribbon of death" after so many crashes and multiple car pileups occurred. This section will likely also be prone to flooding during heavy rain events. How will groundwater contamination be prevented if this section is below the water table and soil contamination from the Asarco Superfund site has not been adequately cleaned up? I also have difficulty envisioning a park above the multi-lane highway as a calming place to spend time with the constant traffic noise and air pollution that will waft up from below. I believe this park will cause more stress and poor health, contrary to the intended outcome. The below-grade highway would be too close to Swansea Elementary School. In addition, this proposed project would be absurdly expensive, an irresponsible use of taxpayer dollars. Instead, I urge CDOT to study in detail the proposed alternative that reroutes I-70 onto the existing I-76 and I-270 highways. This alternative plan that would turn the existing stretch of I-70 into a tree-lined boulevard makes infinitely more sense to me. It would be safer for area residents, would raise property values and stimulate business development, and would truly reunite the Elyria, Globeville and Swansea neighborhoods, at a much lower cost. I sometimes walk or ride my bicycle around Rocky Mountain Lake Park and Berkeley Lake Park, but the constant noise from I-70 traffic there is unnerving. If I-70 were rerouted, these parks would be much more pleasant places to spend time. Please give serious consideration to this sensible and much more cost-effective, alternative proposal. Please do an SEIS on the full re-route plan that includes both I-76 and I-270 highways. Thank you.

Dear CDOT, Please consider studying the I270/76 route as opposed to the expanded and lowered highway through the city. I believe this route would improve the aesthetics of Denver, as well as reducing pollution and noise. I also think that turning 48th avenue into a Boulevard would enhance travel through the city. I think this route would make the city more pleasing to the eye and make it more pedestrian friendly city. I also think this would reduce pollution downtown, making it a more desirable and liveable city. I think that with these improvements we can be a model for other cities. I also am a proponent of removing the highway from the Swansea/Globeville communities and allowing these neighborhoods to be able to connect with their neighbors as well as improving their health. Thanks for your time.

The project seems to represent more social engineering than traffic engineering, and the rhetoric surrounding it sounds very pie-in-the-sky. This project is, as CDOT claims, a 100 year project: it rests on speculations about Denver's future that are too far away to see at all and will probably take 100 years to complete, given the funding mechanism. This plan, once in motion, will be irrevocable, and I cannot support it. Life for the surrounding neighborhoods will be hell for the foreseeable future. Better to fix the existing structural defects of the existing highway and leave resources for other needs.

I am very concerned as a native of North Denver of this proposal. It is time to listen to the community and not make the same mistake that was originally made when I 70 was constructed where it is, going through both parks, Rocky Mountain and Berkeley. The environmental impact needs to be addressed more thoroughly, and real alternatives and solutions that deal with climate change need to be seriously considered. Stop this plan now and listen to the communities involved.

I am submitting my comments to voice my concerns with the I70 expansion. As an active Sunny Side community member I deal with the already problematic noise pollution and traffic of I70 on a daily basis. With the widening of the road it will not only increase the truck traffic on I70 which directly attributes to air pollution but the noise pollution of the semi-trucks utilizing their Jake brakes to slow down. The proposed plan to widen the already massive highway is not the solution as this only attributes to the problem of adding more traffic to the already congested area. Sunny Side and North Highlands is a prime spot for urban revitalization. During construction the project will negatively impact the area as it will cause more traffic to be filtered into subsequent city streets. With the increased traffic this can potentially add to the dangers of our children playing in the area, increased crime, pollution etc. As previously suggested, will CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76? This alternative only make the most logical and financial sense, it will provide the needed space for truck traffic and lessen vehicular traffic along the I-70 corridor impacted those critical neighborhoods. What is CDOT plans if they move forward with the expansion of I70 will they provide noise abatement walls which extend past the wood walls spanning from Pecos to Federal? Why would CDOT think that the expansion West of I25 not be next as this will only cause a bottle neck of traffic traveling east or west bound! I would urge CDOT to do what is financially responsible for the communities surrounding the areas not only to properly assess the impacts of the expansion but provide a study on the effect of Noise Pollution, air Pollution and the economic impact to the community. Proper planning can lead to a positive change, improper planning will cause decades of hardship for the community.

I strongly oppose CDOT's proposal to expand I-70 in the vicinity of Elyria, Globeville, and Swansea. If implemented, this proposal would further expose the residents of these neighborhoods to dangerous emissions that have already diminished their health and life expectancy significantly compared with the rest of the City. It is especially shameful that the children who attend Swansea Elementary School have been exposed for so many years to conditions that have weakened their respiratory systems caused so many of them to have asthma. To suggest that a worsened situation with this enormous expansion can be mitigated defies belief. Transportation planners acknowledge the damage done to neighborhoods and cities when the interstate system was built through the hearts of cities, and have said that it would not be built that way today. That is why beltways have been added around many cities, and that is what should be done in Denver with this project. I support the full re-routing of I-70 to I-270 and I-76, which would avoid existing residential communities. It would relieve these three communities of an environmental degradation burden they should have never had to shoulder. To suggest that widening I-70 will unite neighborhoods that have been cut-off by the existing highway seems to silly to even require comment. Let me just say that I find statements to that effect entirely unconvincing. If the City had any thoughts of supporting the neighborhoods, they would have done something before. With this plan, even more disadvantaged families will lose their homes. Finally, the costs to expand and bury this portion of I-70 seem understated, while the cost of the re-route option appears overstated, tipping the argument inappropriately in the direction of CDOT's preferred option. Financing costs have not been included, yet they will surely be required. The idea of diverting the equivalent of 8 years of state bridge maintenance funds to partially fund this project causes me great concern. It is well known that bridge maintenance in Colorado and in the United States has been dangerously neglected. Using these scarce funds for a project that is unnecessary is inexcusable because fewer people are driving and Fast Tracks is expanding.

I got an error when submitting my online form. Below are my comments. Hello. I have strong reservations on the partial covered lowered alternative. The huge financial cost without clear means of funding is very disturbing. The environmental impact from the construction is also a huge concern. I see the plans of a park area above the highway, but I wonder how environmentally friendly and positive will that area so close to a super-highway be? The disruption to the Swansea elementary school seems unfair as does displacing residents of that economically fragile neighborhood. I strongly am in favor of a renewed consideration of the re-route of I-70 to I-76.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a resident of east Denver (Stapleton) and frequently drive on the section of I-70 between I-25 and Tower road. My comment is in regards to the currently-rejected option of re-routing the section of I-70 to along I-270/I-76. I urge the group heading the redevelopment of I-70 to re-visit this option. I understand that there is a significant increase in cost in the re-routing option, but my question is whether the sale and development of the land which I-70 currently sits on between I-76 & 270 could be structured to help pay for a substantial portion of this increased cost? Given the successful redevelopment of Stapleton and Lowry, having additional land in the city to develop, while also moving the highway to the city outskirts, but not too far, seems to make sense, both financially and socially, creating a better city for all of us, and for generations to come.

Please put me down as vehemently opposed to the proposed plan of widening and placing I-70 below ground in its current place. The cost is prohibitive and the effects on the surrounding neighborhoods are very undesirable. I support rerouting the highway.

Rerouting the I-70 corridor to the north utilizing the I-76 & 270 roadways would create many benefits including: 1. Open up and make more inclusive the Swansea neighborhood 2. Improve economic development of the existing streets under the viaduct 3. Provide expansion space for future I-70 needs 4. Route ever increasing traffic through more industrial and less residential areas.

This is an environmentally unsafe project, which would upset hazardous waste already there. I think it would increase air pollution. And the expense is unnecessary and excessive. As a taxpayer, I strongly oppose this project. There's an alternative which is much much less expensive and less dangerous from an environmental perspective. Please do NOT do this unwise project.

After reviewing the EIS and the SEIS, I find both deficient in their treatment of historic resources. The communities impacted are significant for their historic industries, architecture, ethnic communities, and religious, social, and educational institutions. Yet the two documents provide very little historic context for evaluating the resources within the communities. The survey forms completed appear to have focused almost exclusively on the architecture (while apparently comparing it to the way buildings looked at the beginning of the twentieth century rather than 50 years from the present). Certainly the area continued to have significant history and development after the early twentieth century. In terms of environmental justice, it is apparent that to expand the existing highway would be harmful to the low income and ethnic communities now along its route. Property values in the area are already lower than in other parts of Denver for similar properties. The residents suffer from high levels of health-related impacts due to the high level of truck and automobile traffic, which impacts the air quality, noise levels, and visual aspects of the neighborhoods. It is incredible that the preferred alternative is a route that strongly negatively impacts Swansea Elementary's environmental qualities. As someone who lives in a neighborhood outside the APE of the proposed project but within a few blocks of I70, I can testify first-hand to the horrible noise and air pollution it produces. As a citizen of Denver, I am appalled that some members of the Denver City Council voiced support for a project that has no definite price tag, but is likely to be the largest expense in the state's transportation history. I strongly urge study of the alternative route identified by neighborhood groups known as Unite North Metro Denver. North Denver never wanted this highway, but it's wishes were ignored. There is an alternative that would be better for our citizen's health and possibly less expensive. Please show some humanity and examine the alternative route.

I am an AICP City Planner and I am strongly opposed to the SDEIS proposal. CDOT NEEDS to do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. The current proposal is environmentally and fiscally irresponsible and corrupts the ideas of good planning for those people in need and for those people using the area in the future. It had been proven time and time again that more roads only bring more cars and future generations have already shown a strong preference for not wanting the old car-commuter paradigm. While I'm grateful that you are opening up some time for public comment, I'm afraid that this effort is just tokenism at its worst. Beautiful new parks connecting neighborhoods is a great thing to have - but not with this plan and not in this area. Yes, a mistake was made by building a major interstate through established neighborhoods 50 years ago. However, that was 50 years ago and the neighborhoods have had 50 years to organically find their ways around that mistake that was forced upon them. A dear friend lives in that neighborhood - immediately adjacent to what will be a park if the current plan goes through. I've spent a good deal of time in this neighborhood. This proposed plan will only further alienate these people from this neighborhood. Just like much of the rest of Denver, it will force lower income families from the area because the cost of housing will go up. This is an elitist plan that doesn't really take the actual families' welfare into account - again. It is a plan made by people who've never grown up in neighborhoods like this, and their suppositions about it making the neighborhood better for them are wrong and short-sighted. There are so many rich and creative alternatives that are available that will still allow your "problem solvers" to showcase their talents while not stripping a neighborhood of its culture and identity any further than it already has. This is a situation where, if you've read the "Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy" - the proponents of the current proposal are Vogons and are wearing blinders to the gestalt of the impact of their grand highway plan. One alternative is to close I-70 between Wadsworth Avenue and Central Park Boulevard, and to divert traffic north of the current alignment onto I-76 and I-270. There could be construction of a surface boulevard along what currently is Brighton Boulevard that would funnel traffic from DIA, Green Valley Ranch and Montebello into downtown Denver along Brighton Boulevard and make this route the gateway into the city. It would open up space along this new boulevard for redevelopment, reintegrate the Globeville, Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods into the city, and raise property values. Additionally, along this reroute, CDOT already owns almost all the land it needs for development, and the impact on the surrounding residents and businesses would be reduced to almost nothing. If I lived along that stretch - that is what I would prefer. Instead - I am only a few blocks away and an educated, experienced planner. I hope you will stop the current plan from moving forward and allow a more organic, less sterilizing option to move forward. If not for the people who live there now, then at least for the people who will use the area in the future. Thank you.

Re-routing I-70 to I-76 and 270 make would put less impact on the NW Denver neighborhoods and would cost less, I don't understand why the plan is to widening the Free is moving forward.

I strongly request you reconsider studying an alternative route for I-70. Specifically I ask that you do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Now is the BEST (probably ONLY) time to reroute I-70 out of several neighborhoods within the city of Denver. A reroute will help the city become the world-class city it should be. Adding traffic, noise-pollution, air-pollution and taking up more space in the core of the city is NOT what forward-thinking cities are doing. They are rerouting their highways around their city centers. PLEASE listen to your citizens and study the alternative route that includes I-270 & I-76. Thank you for your time.

I'd love to see a study of the alternate route - is expansion truly necessary? Turning that part of the i70 into more of a boulevard could be awesome, and is worth investigating.

My comments pertain to all of the above. The current highway and proposed plan by CDOT effects every aspect of life along the I-70 corridor. This includes noise, pollution, fragmented neighborhoods, environmental justice, and impacts of property values. It makes more sense to restore this historic part of the city (North Denver). It won't be what it was at the turn of the century, it would be even better. It has an eclectic population and the capacity to be one of the nicer parts of the city. As for the east side near Swansea re-routing of the highway could do a lot to bring these neighborhoods back up to a better economic level. I have done a lot of work in this area on the ASARCO Superfund site. I know that re-routing the highway would give those neighborhoods a huge boost of hope and more people would be willing to invest in it's future. Not re-routing the highway to I-76, especially when it only adds 2 miles to the drive, would show these areas of the city that CDOT does not care about the future of North Denver but only in it's own future. It would be a waste of money what they are proposing, would exhaust the bridge fund and destroys neighborhoods. The re-routing would go through an existing industrial area that would also be in con-junction with the light-rail being constructed and would cause a lot less disruption to the current I-70. The new Boulevard going into the city could also relieve a lot of traffic from being on the Mousetrap part of the highway. Re-routing makes sense for everyone especially the taxpayers of North Denver.

Please explore other ways! I think this is an awful idea and the neighbors' health will be badly affected. Thank you.

Please heed the eloquent petition by DU - they have addressed many of the problems with this proposal, and I believe that our neighborhood/ DPS's Centennial K-5 school on Tennyson and 44th would also be adversely affected. Your attention and consideration are much appreciated in seeking an alternative solution elizabeth faulhaber

I'm not in favor of widening the highway to ten lanes. We should be seeking out more environmentally friendly solutions and not just assuming there will be more cars on the road. Let's remove the highways from the city like SF and Portland.

I am concerned about the proposed expansion of I70. I hope CDOT will reconsider and reroute the highway to I76. Thank you.

This is an opportunity to rectify the mistake made years ago of putting the highway through once vibrant neighborhoods. Please do a full SEIS study of the re-route of I-70, I-76 and I-270. A serious consideration of re-routing in order to re-unite our neighborhood would remedy the injustice committed by the current routing. CDOT already owns the right-of-way needed to widen I-76 and I-270, without taking any homes or businesses and, along the I-76 and I-270 routes there are 0 neighborhoods that are immediately-adjacent to the freeways, compared to 11 along I-70 between Stapleton's Central Park Blvd and Harlan [the re-route area] that are directly impacted. We do not need such a large expansion of the interstate particularly involving toll roads dependent on a public private partnership. I do not support this funding scheme or the width of the expansion. CDOT should be exploring ways of promoting public transportation as millennials are increasingly interested in moving away from cars. I am also concerned about the air quality associated with this project and the environmental burden it places on the neighborhood. The project is way too close to Swansea School and will place an undue burden on these already underprivileged kids. Please do not increase the pollution on this school and others along the corridor. I do not believe the plan to put the highway in a trench is safe because (1) it creates flood hazard (already being experienced on I-25), (2) it digs into a Superfund site, (3) increases air pollution in the construction. CDOT has not been forthcoming about the construction costs vs. the cost of a re-route. The re-route option is better for our city and deserves to be explored in depth.

CDOT is in love with the COMPLEX solution (tunnel, lid, park) because it is complex. As an engineer, I understand. You want to do interesting work and not something as simple as rerouting I-70 over 270 and 76. It is past time to look seriously at the simple, surface route. The citizens of north Denver have been abused long enough. It is time to bring two neighborhoods back into the city.

I love the idea of rebuilding I-70, just NOT the plans CDOT has presented to us. Please rethink the plans and figure out a different route for I-70. One that would work for everyone involved and NOT be anything like the new Santa Fe exit onto I-25. That is the worst design and apparently is not working for the flow of traffic.

I think that relocating I-70 to the existing I-76/270 corridor should be the preferred alternative. That area is already more industrial in nature and would not be as negatively impacted by an increase in traffic. Reclaiming the stretch of I-70 from Quebec to Harlan would be an unprecedented opportunity to reunite the neighborhoods north of the the current highway and encourage redevelopment along a grand boulevard where 48th/46th Avenues are now.

Widening I70 is a poor solution to a problem that has many less impactful solutions. We need to leave these already highly impacted neighborhoods alone. There are options that are less impactful to the surrounding communities. We need to be spending our money on transportation that is future looking and if we as a community feel it is absolutely necessary to have more road options we should be looking at I76 expansion with less community impact.

Water Drainage Dangers. Be advised, the water that is collected in the basin of the 30 foot deep "trough" will need more than just a little green pipeline to the Platte. Don't you realize the water/snow when it collects follows the path of least resistance, In this instance, would make a lake out of Swansea. The Platte will be breaching it's banks. It will be deep everywhere, not just in the Basin created by the covered ditch. I've seen 38th and Fox under water with moderate rain runoff. I-25 @ Downing, same thing. What's different about this? Do you honestly think we are going to let the taxpayers of Denver foot the bill for maintaining this contrivance, for 35 years? Thank you for your time.

I love Denver and I believe this project goes against everything the citizens of this city stand for. We don't need an expansion of I-70. The interstate is way too close to the city as it is. The pollution that it already produces goes against our values. I can't imagine the smog an expansion would create. This project would not fix anything but increase the problems we are trying to solve. Today more and more people are moving back into the city. I believe we should focus on better local public transportation instead of expanding an interstate that will eventually become less and less used. Why expand it? Why not make I-70 into a BLVD? I just don't understand why we are using studies and models from 50 years ago to do this project. The world has changed. I am in my 20's and people my age don't use the interstate. We are selling our cars. Staying local. Buying local. We care about the future of this city. Thank you

Please consider the alternatives to the proposed scheme. As someone who holds a master's degree in architecture AND urban design I support the alternative that directs traffic north and utilizes existing ROWs. Its clear to me that the scheme CDOT prefers is a political matter by keeping the problem within the County of Denver. However it's time to start having multi-county meetings to discuss how the right idea can be implemented because taking away people's land and furthering the social injustice that's already been committed to Swansea and surrounding neighborhoods IS NOT THE RIGHT ANSWER! TURN EXISTING I70 INTO A BOULEVARD AND RECONNECT THE NEIGHBORHOOD!

It is imperative that CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. -The current plan is not comprehensively researched, and we must take the time to make a long-term plan that takes into account the expected growth of the Denver area. -I'm concerned that the current expansion plans would create a major bottleneck when 10 lanes come down to 6 after Pecos. - 11 neighborhoods would be affected by widening I70. If CDOT instead chose to reroute I70 traffic around 270 / 76, ZERO neighborhoods would be affected and it would only add 1-2 minutes to the drive!! Please do the responsible thing and take the time to comprehensively evaluate the options.

Concerned about air quality and environmental pollutants. These will have lifelong health consequences for people living in the surrounding area. Your consideration is greatly appreciated.

I believe it is a great environmental injustice to carry out the proposed I-70 east CDOT preferred option. Globeville and Elyria Swansea are both neighborhoods that have endured high levels of pollution. Various studies have shown the health impacts that result from living in close proximity to a highway. Dr. Manuel Pastor from the University of Southern California has found that increased respiratory risks have a negative impact on a student's school performance. This is important to consider since the highway expansion would be very close to Swansea Elementary. As a commuter of I-70, I do not wish to drive faster to where I need to go at the expense of the low-income community that lives close by. Asthma rates are high in this area already and with the construction and increased amount of traffic, pollution will sure increase and impact more lives with asthma. The DEIS mentions that diesel particulate matter is the greatest toxic concern emitted from heavy diesel vehicles and that these emissions could increase during construction (p.5.10-3 sidebar and Exhibit 5.10-24). CDOT should not expand the width of the highway considering the likelihood increased pollution will have on the health of the community. This community is a poor community with little resources and little ability to seek treatment or another place to move. The majority of the residents are Spanish speaking and have no idea about the project or the health impacts that could escalate for that matter. I ask that the re-route option be studied and that the results be shared with the community to decide what would be best for their community's health.

"The expanded freeway and its new service roads will be well-within 100 feet of the wall of Swansea Elementary. Imagine the vibration, the pollution, the noise, the danger in getting to school [which serves kids from both sides of the freeway]. Their planned mitigation efforts can't possibly be enough. These kids deserve better." This states the case for me. I work at Swansea which is a vibrant community. The health and wellbeing of the children comes before any not well considered freeway plans. I also live in the Regis area and love my community the way it is.

I believe CDOT is pushing their way through our neighborhoods without any concern to the long-term effects of their widening plan. They are creating more lanes when it is proven public transportation is on the rise. They will privatize toll lanes to the highest bidder just like they did for US36. The plan will cut off many streets previously open thus cutting off, yet again, our neighborhoods. Residents are warned not to eat anything grown from the soil in these neighborhoods as it is a superfund site. What happens to residents when CDOT spends years of digging into the ground for this project? Not to mention the flooding concerns many people have with the lowered highway: this area is a flood zone after all. Many people feel CDOT has ignored our neighborhoods, specifically when it comes to the idea of re-routing I-70 to the north. While the project has its merits, CDOT has gone about it the wrong way and that is why I am against this project.

CDOT insisting on widening a freeway in a neighborhood in which they would refuse to live? They would refuse to live in Globeville/Elyria-Swansea because it is not good enough for them -- the air quality is dangerous, the noise is awful, the truck traffic is disgusting and frustrating, it stinks from pollution, it is unhealthy, the property values are extremely low, it is poor, ugly, devastated by the original intrusion of I-70 which virtually destroyed a community and its historic value to Denver. Would any member of CDOT or any member of the PPP move into Globeville/Elyria-Swansea? The answer is no. Would any member even spend the night there? Would any member of CDT or the PPP allow their child to attend Swansea Elementary, let alone spend the night? How about letting their child play on ground just above the freeway? Not once, but day after day, as part of a school day? If members of CDOT and the PPP lived in Globeville/Elyria-Swansea, they would re-route I-70. They would use the right-of-way already owned by CDOT to widen I-76 and I-270. There are no existing homes and businesses along this right-of-way that have to be taken to accomplish the expansion. CDOT's involvement with I-70 over and around Vail actually enhanced the beauty of the environment and the road. That can be done with I-70, and it can be done at less than half the cost of expansion of the existing freeway. The PPP does not serve the public interest. It is a bigger potential problem than what is happening with I-36. These partnerships have to work for the public -- not against them. And why would anyone want to put part of the freeway underground? Why would CDOT recreate the days of the tunnel -- when wreck after wreck after wreck occurred in and around the tunnel on I-70? Who will profit from that -- the people who lose their lives? I lived in LA for five years -- why does CDOT insist on bringing that driving lifestyle to Denver? Large multi-lane freeways are incredibly difficult to maneuver, they are dangerous and destructive to comfortable commuting, and ease of commute. They are a recipe for road rage waiting to happen. And they are unnecessary to a future where patterns of commute will change -- are changing as the city becomes a more desirable place to live. What CDOT is proposing is insane -- it meets Einstein's definition of insanity: doing the same thing over again and expecting a different result. A whole other generation will be subjected to the devastation on the Globeville/Elyria-Swansea community. More people will have health problems because of the pollution, noise and dangerous conditions. It is insane to widen and expand I-70 as CDOT proposes, particularly in light of fact that there is an I-76/I-270 alternative that will be half the cost, with none of the devastation. If CDOT must absolutely refuse to put people (human beings) and their communities first, then put our tax dollars first. CDOT has a perfectly sound alternative: THE I-76/I-270 BOULEVARD.

Why do we need to spend \$1.8 billion dollars to: -endanger school children -add more poisons to our lives -increase noise pollution -demolish retail in urban areas that are already undersupplied with the basics for daily living -ruin more historical sites -cause additional traffic jams on major routes, thereby causing more air pollution and shortening the time that working parents spend with their families -create enormous, unnecessary, and potentially disastrous changes, partly for the benefit of private corporations? What we DO need to do is conduct an SEIS on a full reroute of I-70 that includes I-270 and I-76. Road expansion in those areas will add some traffic noise and will inconvenience a few drivers, but it won't ruin the lives of thousands of people living in a low-income neighborhood that will likely be devastated by the project. THINK ABOUT IT: Would YOU want to live in Globeville, Elyria or Swansea during or after this monstrous, unnecessary I-70 expansion project, knowing that it might shorten your family's lifespan and perhaps take the life of someone you love?

I'm very concerned this is not the best option. First, do we really need to expand I70 this much, including 4 new toll lanes? I travel on this stretch of I70 and even during high traffic times, the slow downs do not create that much of a delay. Second, the economic and environmental impacts on the neighborhoods are too high. The property values on adjacent homes would drop dramatically, with many people being unable to move. There are several schools that will be affected by the pollution and this is irresponsible to our youth. And a good way to decrease Colorado's future growth and economy. Third, the cost of this project is extremely high and taxpayers do not want their money spent this way. And finally, CDOT is creating an unsafe roadway that will cause accidents, including deaths, because the road does not get direct sunlight in the winter time. I would not feel safe on this road and would take other routes because of these reasons. CDOT has a responsibility to taxpayers and the community do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76 before moving ahead with this project.

My concern is that although this project has been discussed for years, it does not seem that CDOT is listening to any concerns of the public. Please re-think this project or at least make some concessions in regards to public wants. Shrinking the foot print of this project is a must - 300+ feet wide is TOO MUCH. Please consider a tiered highway project or looking into and providing a cost estimate for the I-76 Re-route proposal. DO NOT shut down access to York Street as this will only congest Colorado Blvd and Downing Streets even more than now as those will be the only two thoroughfares. I don't believe CDOT has answered any or all questions put forth by the general public or organized groups. This is a HORRIBLE project and the people that it will affect need to be heard. CDOT cannot just make these decisions leaving us to deal with the consequences. Thank you

I have been a life long resident of North Denver. My family moved here when I was 12 years old and my Grandmother lived here since 1955. I am 61. I remember the neighborhood before I-70 was brought in. It was quiet and clean, a beautiful part of denver with two parks with lakes. When I-70 was built it destroyed many charming little homes and devastated the community. For the Globeville, Swansea, Neighborhoods it was much worse. Their communities were cut in half by a bridge that rained pollution and noise down upon their lives. According to a health study made by Denver their lives have been shortened by 3.5 years because of the increased pollution. So now CDOT wants to replace the bridge with a trench and widen the highway to 10 lanes as far west as I-25? How much time will it be till they want to extend 10 lanes on through to Wadsworth and destroy more homes in the Berkley, Regis, Sunnyside neighborhoods? This is not acceptable. These older neighborhoods have suffered enough. Part of CDOT's plan is to put a large cover over the new trench and make a park on top next to Swansea grade School. I work for the Denver Fire Dept. and I for see a problem if a large tanker truck crashes with hazardous Materials like gasoline. A large tanker fire under the trench cover will close the highway and expose the children at Swansea grade school to a dangerous environment. It will also create a dangerous environment for anyone trapped in a traffic jam under the trench cover. I-70 was built in the early sixties and it took CDOT till 1979 to finally build wooden sound barriers through North Denver. CDOT has consistently shown disregard toward the North Denver Neighborhoods. Its time to stop the proposed widening and burying of I-70. The cost of maintaining a highway in a trench and keep the nearby Platte river from flooding it are just plain stupid. Large pumps will be needed to keep the ground water out. The water will have to be treated before putting it back into the ecosystem. There is a better idea to improve I-70. Move it! It never should have been built where it is and there is a good alternative in the idea of moving it to the 270-I76 alignment. This alternative will keep the highway on grade without the need for trenches or concrete covers or viaducts that destroy neighborhoods and create polluted environments that sicken people and shorten their lives. CDOT must be forced to study this alternative to their current plan. Moving the Highway will finally restore the older neighborhoods, create a healthy environment for people to live, and provide a safer highway for motorist using the rerouted I-70.

Please consider again the use of I76 and I270 as a preferred route for I70. It makes more sense to me to put the highway through the more industrial area reuniting the north Denver neighborhoods to create a better metropolitan area for the future. Thank you

Hello,  
CDOT's I-70 east corridor highway should be redirected away from the Globeville and Elyria/Swansea neighborhoods of northeast Denver. Rather, it should utilize the I-270 alignment. The current I-70 alignment should be converted to surface arterial streets to help restore and improve this important neighborhood. City neighborhoods in general should be restored and should primarily exist to serve people, with lively city streets, and focus on pedestrians. City neighborhoods should not be given over to moving huge volumes of cars.

I feel that the I-76 - I-270 loop is the best option. It will take less time and money and have less of an impact on Colorado residents. It just makes more sense, period! All CDOT needs to do to I-70 is replace the bridge. Thank you,

I am opposed to burying I-70 along its current route. The plan to re-route the highway through I-270 and I-76 is preferable, and will create a new boulevard along 40th Ave. that will revitalize the area around the Coliseum and Stock Show Complex.

I have been reading in the Denver Post about the concerns regarding health issues for students that attend elementary school near the proposed construction for I-70, and would like to add my voice to those concerns. Truly, this neighborhood has suffered enough because of I70. To ask them to further risk their already compromised children is unconscionable. Even with mitigation, the health risks are great for these students. Is it really reasonable to assume we can keep these children indoors for the 3 year duration of the construction? Of course not. Please reconsider the route - I am a proponent of the I270 / I76 corridor option, as there is little residential development along that route. Thanks for your attention.

I think the preferred alternative is an innovative design that can reconnect two neighborhoods through the park/cap design and push through traffic below grade which should lessen maintenance required with the current viaduct. It seems like the right thing to do but those who are afraid of change will be very vocal against the plan. Great job, can't wait for it to get built.

I am compelled to speak out against CDOT forcing the community to simply accept this proposal. It's littered with bad ideas. I am concerned about how much this will cost the city and its taxpayers, and I have serious concerns about public-private partnership approach. I wish CDOT would take the reroute alternative (I-270, I-76) seriously. I believe that CDOT needs to do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Denver is evolving into a multi-modal city that doesn't need bigger/wider highways, but rather, needs 21st century solutions to the transportation challenges of the future. You are taking advantage of the weakest communities among us, Elyria, Swansea and Globeville. Our neighbors in these communities are the most vulnerable, with little to no money, little political influence, and little to no voice in this matter. You hold meetings with them and pretend to listen. This is shameful!

I live in area of I-70 when it was first built going through Denver on west side. Also I-25, it was the river bed of Platte river. Every time it rains, it would flood. They finally have it, it's almost a good road. But it had taken from the first day it was built to now. I hope I-70 is not I-25 all over again. With the new plan for I-70, you still have all traffic going on I-25 north and south. Trucker are always on route going east and west. With I-270 and I-76 already in place, it would be better to expand through two roads. It would move trucker out of main part of town along with traffic that goes with it. It would be like building another C-470 or bypass city. Same that was done when DIA was built, how airport is in its own area. Plus it has room to add more planning strips and building for the future. It won't have to move in the future. I-70 should be built for the future and not just a path job. Like to have been in the past.

We have the opportunity now to fix a mistake that was made over 50 years ago and instead do something that could benefit Denver on so many different levels - economically, ecologically, culturally, etc. We should have the hindsight to see the error that was made in the past and take the necessary steps to repair the damage that was done when I-70 was built through the heart of north Denver. I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative. Thank you!

I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.

I attended a meeting at Scheitler rec center in Denver where I heard very compelling reasons why CDOT should perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative. Thank you

I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.



I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
There are several reasons why the proposal to evaluate routing I-70 traffic from I-270 to I-76 makes a lot of sense. But saving lives would be the highest on my list. I personally have witnessed the death of people on I-70 at the "death curve" as it flows around Berkley park. I know of at least three fatalities and countless horrible accidents because the bend is so tight. Looking at history, the reason why I-70 was routed through this neighborhood and forced through this tight curve was because of the Lakeside mall developers back in the 60s wanted more traffic by their mall. Now the mall is gone but the dangerous circumstances remain. So for 50 years, this stupid decision based on greed has cost many many lives. It's time to be accountable and make the correct decision this time and route the traffic where it is more safe for the drivers on I-70. Please do the right by the citizens of Denver, Colorado, and all travelers on I-70 and have CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative. Lives are on the line. Here is a link to a map showing the extremely dangerous curve around Berkley lake: <a href="https://maps.google.com/maps?q=80212&amp;hl=en&amp;ll=39.782091,-105.048909&amp;spn=0.020085,0.040727&amp;sll=38.997934,-105.550567&amp;sspn=5.198547,10.426025&amp;t=h&amp;hnear=Denver,+Colorado+80212&amp;z=15">https://maps.google.com/maps?q=80212&amp;hl=en&amp;ll=39.782091,-105.048909&amp;spn=0.020085,0.040727&amp;sll=38.997934,-105.550567&amp;sspn=5.198547,10.426025&amp;t=h&amp;hnear=Denver,+Colorado+80212&amp;z=15</a>
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative. I lived for 7 years on 49th and Stuart Street and experienced first-hand in that brief amount of time, how the noise level increased from freeway traffic. Widening I-70 in the Metro area where there is not enough open space to counteract the negative impact to residential areas is a very poor idea and as a former resident, I urge you to perform the supplemental EIS.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative. My husband and I strongly support this supplemental EIS especially to compare the cost in dollars, as well as the cost in disrupting peoples' lives with eminent domain and the uprooting that follows.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative. Why continue the mistakes made in the 1960s by wiping out more of our neighborhoods by widening I-70? It is possible to re-route some of the I-70 traffic, so why not do that instead? Thus, saving long established neighborhoods not to mention saving stress and heartbreak among your constituents.
I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative. As a young child, I remember when I-70 was originally constructed through Northwest Denver. It was incredibly destructive, separating neighborhoods, moving families who didn't want to move, tearing down landmarks including Queen of Heaven Orphanage. To contemplate that type of destruction again is unthinkable, especially when there is a viable alternative in the utilization of I-76 and I-270. I strongly suggest an Environmental Impact Study considering that alternative.

<p>I am very concerned and sad for the neighborhoods that will be directly impacted by the recommended solution for fixing the I-70 bridge. I used to work at the Denver Rescue Mission Headquarters and interacted a lot with the neighbors from the communities that surrounded I-70. The noise and air-pollution in those communities was terrible. The economic, social and health impact from I-70 cutting through these neighborhoods with deep family histories was devastating. And yet - because they are poor, it doesn't seem like anybody cares. This sort of expansion would never be proposed in wealthy neighborhoods! I would like to ask CDOT to do a SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Thank you!</p>
<p>I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative.</p>
<p>I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative. The neighborhoods of North Denver have been decimated in the past by thoughtless encroachment of interstate expansion. Let's stop... think . . . and find a better way forward that allows the people a voice in how we want to LIVE in Denver.</p>
<p>I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative. As there is only industrial above Swansea, it makes sense to re-integrate that neighborhood into the city.</p>
<p>I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative.</p>
<p>I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative. More information is never the issue, whereas a lack of information can cause serious problems.</p>
<p>I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative.</p>
<p>I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative. The idea of widening I-70 through northwest Denver is particularly troubling!</p>
<p>I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative.</p>
<p>I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative.</p>
<p>Hello, I have lived all my life in North Denver along I - 70. I went to school with students from Globeville and Swansea whose lives and health were impacted by I -70. My husband and I chose to buy a home just north of I - 70 and look forward to a long life there. However, the plans to expand the highway make me very nervous. It is already a loud and dirty highway that impacts our health and property values. I also commute everyday to Lowry on the highway. I wish so much for a green boulevard where I can bike commute to work, that improves our property values and keeps our neighborhood clean. In addition, I am completely opposed to the environmental racism that an expansion of I -70 would promote. Why do the poorer and minority communities in our city need to suffer. I very much support the alternative to route the highway through I -76 with a boulevard option for commuting across town. Thank you in advance.</p>
<p>As a resident who lives approximately 7 blocks from the current location of I-70, I am concerned with many aspects of the proposed widening of I-70, specifically (but not limited to) cost (both construction and maintenance--knowing full well the City of Denver already struggles to maintain the current public spaces/parks/etc), environmental impact, quality of life impact, disturbing of historic neighborhoods and uprooting of families, and of course, the air and noise pollution that the current and potentially wider interstate running through a downtown residential neighborhood would bring. I love the convenience of I-70 being so close, but would trade it in a heartbeat for a quieter, less polluted neighborhood and air. I would like to respectfully request that CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76 and changing the current I-70 to a boulevard.</p>
<p>do whatever you got to do to get it done. the faster the better</p>
<p>To Whom It May Concern: First and foremost, I am unhappy to hear that CDOT is considering replacing this stretch of freeway rather than the only sensible resolution which would be to re-route it via 270 and 76. The re-route would utilize existing freeways which need to be improved anyways, and eliminate the injustice that was done to the Elyria/Swansea/Globeville neighborhoods decades ago when I-70 dissected their neighborhoods in the first place. Secondly, as it stands, I am one of many residents to the south side of the freeway who suffer from inconsiderate speeding and truck traffic through my neighborhood, using our neighborhood streets as a mini-freeway to get to I-70. I feel that any solution needs to consider not only the residents immediately impacted in the vicinity of the freeway's footprint, but also those of us whose neighborhood streets are dangerous because there are inadequate measures and enforcement of freeway-bound traffic racing through our neighborhoods. I strongly support the re-route of I-70 via I-270 and I-76. Please have a conscience and find a way to make this solution happen. Thank you.</p>
<p>Widening I-70 through the city of Denver would negatively impact our city as a whole, our neighborhoods, and most alarmingly, our children. As a concerned citizen and a teacher in DPS, I urge the planning committee to reconsider the current plan and look at an alternative that would truly benefit our entire city without harming particularly disenfranchised neighborhoods and innocent children.</p>

I strongly encourage CDOT to consider the alternative reroute through the non-residential corridor of I-76/I-270. Independent studies have shown it's a cheaper, more environmentally friendly, and much less disruptive alternative to the current plan being considered. People living near I70 have life spans 3 years shorter than the rest of us on average. Why is CDOT blindly pushing through this current plan that will cost much more than a reroute alternative? CDOT is already selling off tax payer funded highways to foreign entities and claiming it's because of dollars and cents, yet they won't seriously look at a cheaper plan that also has many more benefits than just cost. Benefits of reroute option: - reconnects divided neighborhoods - less vehicular air pollution in residential neighborhoods - cheaper upfront construction costs - evenly disperses traffic between rerouted I70 and new Blvd. - safer - less water pollution - cheaper to maintain than a complex tunnel with water mitigation system Why current plan is wrong: - more expensive in short term and long term - air pollution in residential neighborhoods - more dangerous in winter due to highway being in the shadows and low southern sun inability to melt ice on roadway - water pollution from increased need to treat pavement in winter - pollution from sinking roadway into a buried superfund site - long term expense of running and maintaining system to pump water up from buried roadway - traffic jams caused by drivers instinctively slowing down as they dive down and under covered roadway (just look at any tunnel on I70 in the mountains). - flooding caused by heavy rain storms in sunken roadway - further alienating and decreased quality of life for residents in neighborhoods cut off by I70 - fewer people driving in the future means less need for wider I70. Is there not an RTD rail system opening up along that corridor? Current generation of people between 20-30 years old are not tied to owning and driving cars like previous generations. Please reconsider the reroute alternative. Not only is it cheaper now and in the long run, it's much better for the community as a whole.

CDOT is not meeting their stated purpose of creating a multi-modal interstate freeway and rapid transit corridor serving regional and statewide trip. CDOT acknowledges that I-70 serves thousands of tourists traveling from DIA to the mountains (and back). They know they should be working to improve the connectivity and transportation options for the entire region, yet the focus of the preferred alternative is narrowed in scope to drastically (and incredibly expensively) widening one strip of I-70 East. CDOT claims that that the widening of I-70 to 10 lanes on the east side of I-25, but not to the west, will not cause a bottleneck on traffic patterns. Anyone who has ever driven on an interstate through the city knows this does not make any logical sense! Especially when the narrowing occurs at the intersection with another major interstate highway. If CDOT goes through with this plan, they will have missed an opportunity to not only improve I-70 traffic problems, but also to create a better transportation network for north Denver that will last for many, many decades to come. CDOT needs to do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. By rerouting I-70 and creating a boulevard in its place, not only will the economic future of Denver's low-income Globeville, Swansea, and Elyria neighborhoods be greatly improved, but it will also create positive impacts for northwest Denver and Denver's northern neighbors through which the rerouted I-70 would travel. This plan makes sense. CDOT needs to consider it before going forward. I do not live in north Denver and I do not often drive on I-70, but as a citizen of the Metro Area and Colorado, I believe that this issue is very important to all of us. CDOT has a responsibility to make the best decision, one which is cost-effective, and with a vision for the future. The current preferred alternative is not it.

As a fellow resident of the Swansea Neighborhood and concerned citizen, I am very aware of the hazards associated with high traffic highways. The connection between high pollution areas and mortality rates, cancer and other illnesses. These issues were not addressed in the EIS.

When did CDOT become in charge of community planning? These individuals are creating hideously complex, short-sighted and expensive projects to do nothing other than justify their own existence and paychecks. Perhaps if they lived in the communities that they plan further devastate their plans would be different. Think about the children whose life spans have already been cut short due to the pollution alone. Why would CDOT choose to further ostracize the impacted communities from Denver? What good can possibly come from this? I assert that CDOT must do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Thank you.

CDOT's preferred alternative does nothing to mitigate the impact to the local communities. The SEIS indicates that if the mitigation measures are implemented there will be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to the low-income and minority populations. This statement is absolutely false. The preferred alternative only exacerbates the problem. The impact to the neighborhoods (as measured by the width of the scar that the highway leaves on the community) increases from 85 feet (ref: p. 3-15) to 292 feet (ref: Exhibit 3.21). This is an increase in the impact to the neighborhood of 3.2 times! In the SEIS's own assessment of the traffic levels, the impact to the neighborhood as measured by the increase in the peak period traffic increases substantially. See Exhibit ES-4. The preferred alternative recommends lowering the roadway beginning at Brighton Blvd and ending at Colorado Blvd. This distance is approximately 8000 feet of roadway, creating a chasm separating the north and south side of the neighborhoods, while covering only 900 feet of the highway (ref: p. 3-28). In addition to the social justice issues associated with the excessive expansion of I-70, there are numerous technical issues with the preferred alternative. Some of the problems with this alternative are: 1. CDOT couldn't build the old I-70 viaduct with joints that weren't susceptible to premature deterioration. What makes them think that they can do it now when they are covered in dirt and inaccessible for inspection? 2. The study does not consider the costs associated with the sequencing of the construction of a 40' deep excavation cut adjacent to an elevated viaduct. 3. The winter sun will not reach the depths of the roadway and will be a maintenance nightmare. Vehicles with inadequate traction will block the interstate and divert traffic onto the local arterials. CDOT will need plows and dump trucks dedicated to this short stretch of highway to keep it open during inclement weather just like at the Eisenhower Tunnel. 4. Climate change models indicate that we should be expecting higher intensity summer rains in the Front Range. How much pumping infrastructure will be required to keep this area dry? Can we build fail-safe infrastructure that will maintain the functionality of the roadway in extreme events? Recent events would tend to indicate not. From Superstorm Sandy knocking out the New York subway system to our own rain event along the Front Range just last year, why would we design a new highway that will be so susceptible to an event like this. Our infrastructure should be made to be more resilient, not less so. 5. How will storm drains be rerouted in this area? How many pump stations will be needed to be built to bypass the sanitary sewer lines that can no longer flow by gravity? Pumping costs are permanent, ongoing costs, unlike the free cost of harnessing gravity. 6. The soils in this area are contaminated from many years of unregulated industry. How much will disposal cost? How many delays to the project will take place during construction due to new sources of contamination? In contrast to the numerous social justice and technical issues related to the preferred alternative, the alternative to reroute I-70 onto I-270 and I-76 was never fully explored in either the 2008 Draft EIS or the current SEIS. Although there has been continued support for this alternative from the public since the 2008 draft EIS, CDOT has been unwilling to examine this alternative in detail, or even acknowledge the advantages of this approach: 1. The right-of-way is already owned by CDOT for expansion. The impact to adjacent property owners is much smaller than the proposed preferred alternative. 2. This highway already runs through industrial zoning and will impact zero residential properties. 3. The roadway can be expanded largely AT GRADE LEVEL! 4. The I-76/I-270 route can be expanded while the I-70 viaduct is still in-place, greatly simplifying the construction sequencing.

Do NOT expand I-70 at all!! None of the current proposals adequately "reconnect" Swansea-Elyria to the rest of Denver. Nor will they solve our east/west transportation issues. Delaying the I-70 east project and using this time to fully study the alternative of removing the highway and diverting through traffic along the current I-76/ I-270 corridor is the only way to truly reconnect these neighborhoods to the rest of Denver. The environmental impacts on close-in (and all) surrounding neighborhoods will do even more damage to these long-ignored communities. Just because the project has been studied for 10 years is not a good excuse for moving ahead with current proposed plans. Look at the change in driving habits that has occurred in the last decade. True forward thinkers are recognizing the trend for LESS car travel/use and are planning accordingly. Why is CDOT plunging ahead knowing that auto use will continue to go DOWN? The loudest voices in the room have always been those who have had big organizations/money behind them. The residents of Swansea-Elyria have never stood a chance against that.

CDOT reports that "53 residences and 21 businesses will be acquired by the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative. CDOT will follow all federal and state regulations that require payment for properties based on fair market value and for the relocation of residents displaced by the project". We know that this can be very misleading, since the fair market value of property adjacent to an interstate highway, which must be sold, is certainly much lower than those amounts which will be needed to replace the businesses, homes and apartments which are purchased. Also, where will those citizens who own businesses and residences find affordable areas to establish new businesses and residences? Relocating businesses will eliminate the clientele which the businesses have served. Will they survive long enough to develop a new clientele? Will there be enough potential clients for the relocated businesses to survive? Will families be disrupted by forcing some family members to move while relatives remain? Will support systems remain while residents supported move? Will the relocated residents find new support systems? Because you can't possibly answer these questions, I would strongly recommend finding another option than widening I-70. The "loop option" would solve these problems.

A bad idea that costs too much money with no accountability to taxpayers and severely impacts low-income neighborhoods.

As a resident of northwest Denver I am very much concerned with this proposed project. I am concerned about the increased air and noise pollution that would be added to the area. Also, having learned about the Asarco Superfund Clean-up Site that would be disturbed with the digging of the trench, I'm wondering what would be released in the area and where this contaminated dirt would be moved to. I feel CDOT should do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. I feel this study is critical in order to understand the full impact of this project and possible alternatives. In addition to the health and pollution issues there is the amazing cost of this project. These costs seem to be an unnecessary burden to the tax payer when there are less costly alternatives such as the re-routing of I-70 that would conversely benefit the tax payer. Thank you for considering ALL options.

those who live in the areas need to have more input and those elected from those areas need to pay attention to them. So what happens to the overextended mousetrap and the 3 lanes the 10 will merge to?

The re-routing of I-70 to the I-76 / I-270 should be considered a viable alternative to expanding the current I-70 route. The northern route would allow less impact to communities especially if the current I-70 route were dismantled and turned into an avenue. I live in North West Denver along the I-70 corridor and use both 70 and 76 frequently, If I-70 were moved north to I-76 it would reduce bottle necks at I-25 and keep traffic flowing in a more efficient manner. As a resident likely to be impacted though this project I ask that the relocation of I-70 be evaluated to identify possible benefits of this alternative. Thanks

I travel along this part of I-70 frequently and regularly, not encountering much of any traffic jams during daytime. I understand local traffic is very heavy on this stretch, aside from constant heavy long distance traffic. Imagining this part to have many more lanes, would certainly increase the speed of traffic going straight through, by my observation, cars and trucks already go at an exhilarated speed beyond the posted speed limit. I am also a frequent user in my neighborhood of the new Pecos bridge and round-about, which, in my opinion, has added a huge improvement to the previous situation by keeping the traffic flow even without much stopping and interruption. Also the improvements in my neighborhood on Federal with the planted medians, dividing right and left lanes, are an enormous improvement and solution to fast moving traffic through neighborhoods. Therefore, I don't quite see the reasoning behind the widening of I-70 which only would serve to speed up traffic. I think a city like Denver has an obligation to neighborhoods along highways to find ways to slow down long distance traffic on major highways. We in Denver still drive with our senses in tact, rather than with our heads shifted into 5th gear. The re-routing option of I-70 makes much more sense and I urge CDOT to do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76.

The impact of so many years of construction, displacement of people from their homes, displacement of congregations from their churches, with the final result being an interstate highway that is more than twice its original width, is not worth the hardship. All of those individuals, families, businesses and religious institutions that lie within the eminent domain, where are they to go? Are they displaced from their community and network, to the far boundaries of the city? Can they afford to purchase an equivalent property nearby? And those that are not within "eminent domain" but so very close, what will the quality of their lives be during the term of construction? To demolish the viaduct and then excavate for the proposed underground portion, how will traffic be detoured during this time? It makes sense that it will be diverted to I-270 and I-76 and that is where the traffic pattern should stay on the far boundaries of the city, in an industrial area, where residences, small businesses and religious institutions are not impacted, during construction or in the future when it is complete, and, finally, Globeville, Elyria and Swansea are not separated from the rest of the City by a busy, noisy, dirty interstate highway. The proposed underground strategy with a park over two blocks of it will not be the vibrant, green community connecting tool that it is purported to be. Who would spend time in a park that is directly over a busy, noisy, dirty 300 foot wide interstate highway? I have crossed over interstates on pedestrian bridges and it is not a pleasant experience in which I wish to linger. How is the underground portion not going to be a flood zone in heavy rains, like I-25 at Evans Avenue? How will this underground portion be ventilated? What entity is going to maintain the park/green roof? When one asks the City of Denver Public Works/Transportation Department how they are going to address increased volumes of traffic, the response is that people have to get out of their cars and use alternative transportation such as public transit, walking or cycling. The argument is that our streets cannot be widened; there is no right of way that can be turned into more driving lanes. Why is it that the City of Denver would then allow CDOT to widen I-70 from 117 feet to 300 feet, assume land by eminent domain, and disturb/excavate and haul away thousands of cubic feet of contaminated earth? All in the name of the false promise of a neighborhood friendly solution to replacing an aging viaduct? It is not a fair solution for the people who will be directly impacted and our northeast neighborhoods that will remain isolated from the heart of the City of Denver.

I have several comments to submit about the proposed preferred alternative for the I70 alignment: 1. I am strongly opposed to the permanent closure of the York St exit. As a resident in the Cole neighborhood I use the York St exit frequently and strongly feel that the additional traffic this would add to the Washington St and Colo Blvd access points will be too much for these street to accommodate and will result in excessive traffic congestion and delays and negative impacts to the local communities along these routes. Please retain the York St exit in the selected alternative. 2. I am opposed to the proposed width of the alignment footprint and would ask that the width of the proposed expansion be reduced in order to limit the impact on immediately adjacent communities. I request that the final footprint be limited to 175 ft wide, in support of the Denver city counsel's request for a limited footprint. 3. I would ask that fair housing replacement (3 to 1) be given to communities immediately adjacent to the proposed expansion which would include low income and/or rent controlled units in order to accommodate the needs of these underprivileged communities.

I strongly encourage CDOT to do a SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76 The incredible amount of \$ this project will consume. Many believe it to be grossly-fiscally irresponsible spending from a taxpayer perspective, especially when the re-route appears it will cost about half as much while addressing I-70 congestion issues on BOTH sides of I-25, not just the east side. This is just logical and should be considered. I am a taxpayer of Colorado and live just West of downtown. We should not widen I-70 and should look at other alternatives. CDOT already owns the right-of-way needed to widen I-76 and I-270, without taking any homes or businesses and, along the I-76 and I-270 routes there are 0 neighborhoods that are immediately-adjacent to the freeways, compared to 11 along I-70 between Stapleton's Central Park Blvd and Harlan [the re-route area] that are directly impacted. I live just south of I-70 and I do not want this road widened and would appreciate it if you listened to taxpayers and consider an alternative. I also don't want any additional pollution impacting my home, parks and my children's schools. I feel like air quality is also important for current residents but also for future generations. Thank you for your time and consideration.

I am a teacher at Bruce Randolph School which has been identified by the EPA as being in the pollution zone of I-70. I feel very strongly that expanding i-70 is a short sighted and very bad idea. If there is, in fact, a viable alternative, which I believe there is, then why not explore that more before once again tearing apart the existing neighborhood? Every day on my drive to school, I see students crossing dangerous intersections in front of huge semi-trucks. They cross over on and off ramps, under the interstate and across very busy streets without crosswalks just to get to and from school every day. I don't know how they would even get to school during the construction. Additionally, the homes and businesses that would be lost due to the expansion and the further disruption and division of the neighborhood seems like taking advantage of a voiceless population (again). I just can't let my opinion go unheard on this topic and I hope that the city and CDOT will have the patience and presence to really explore all the benefits and effects of this process, mostly the human and community impact, before moving forward. Thank you.

In the past Near Northeast Denver Communities suffered from lead poisoning issues. Though development will always be necessary . Will the I 70 construction stir up settled lead back into these communities?

Swansea Elementary School is already impacted enough by I70 as it is without putting them through an expansion project. Even without it the kids already have to suffer through increased air pollution and and hazardous materials raining down from the highway while all they are trying to do is play on their playground. I70 has already done enough damage to that neighborhood. Give the kids a break and don't make it worse.

I am an executive recruiter and I place environmental engineers. This plan is NOT appropriate for today's millenials and city planning. People want to be downtown. They want accessible neighborhoods. Stop putting highways in the middle of cities! Additionally, this is a demand for environmental justice for the Globeville, Elyria & Swansea community. The impact is far too great. Pollution in these neighborhoods is already incredibly high. Life expectancy is much shorter for these residents than other nearby Denver communities Go to <http://www.reimaginei-70.com/nmdcts/> and watch the video Unhealthy Conditions.Further-devastating communities that were sliced apart in the 60s by I-70. Taking a now much-larger swath of houses and business. Go to <http://www.reimaginei-70.com/nmdcts/> and watch the Added Real Estate video for more about unfairly-depressed property values. The city is already at risk of future and/or current lawsuits for its' treatment of these neighborhoods. This community already suffers from economic depression from the first intrusion of the I-70 and will likely only continue to do if it is widened. Go to <http://www.reimaginei-70.com/nmdcts/> and watch Neighborhood Conditions for more about the third world condition of neighborhoods adjacent to the highway. Putting Swansea Elementary's playground on top of the freeway. Is that a good idea? CDOT already owns the right-of-way needed to widen I-76 and I-270, without taking any homes or businesses and, along the I-76 and I-270 routes there are 0 neighborhoods that are immediately-adjacent to the freeways, compared to 11 along I-70 between Stapleton's Central Park Blvd and Harlan [the re-route area] that are directly impacted. CDOT shuld do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76.

I live in Globeville and live within 500 ft of I-70 already and have a respiratory illness problem and this will make it worse. plus I would more then likely have to relocate since the new highway would be 200 ft from my house

It potentially violates Title VI of the Civil Rights Act Environmental Justice Standards requiring meaningful outreach to the community (including Spanish speakers) and testimonies by neighborhood residents, a requirement under federal law; It potentially violates President Clinton's 1994 Title VI Executive Order 12898 to collect and assess comprehensive data "to prevent minority communities and low-income communities from being subject to disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects;" It will triple the width of the highway (by the time all the exits lanes, service roads and extra barriers are built) without a compensation plan for displaced homes, schools and businesses; It does not require CDOT or its agents to be accountable to displaced persons and businesses; It leaves Latino communities vulnerable because it doesn't require any specified mitigation assurances for costs and environmental threats. The original I-70 took away 500 homes. This expansion will claim at least 60-125 more; It does not require revenue sharing from toll roads a.k.a. managed lanes with poor and disproportionately impacted communities or minority and women owned businesses; It does not require that CDOT's managers reflect the diversity of the community, and therefore continues to perpetuate the legacy of decisionmakers who are not representative of economically disadvantaged or historically marginalized communities.

I would suggest reassessing the plan to widen I-70 (EIS plan). This plan would not be approved until 2015 and construction most likely would not begin until 2016. There is much to consider and alternative ideas have been expressed. Reassessing would only delay action for another year or so. The safety of the viaduct is not a concern because in 2011 the CDOT spent 24 million on repairs which provided 10-15 years of life for the structure. So, the following are my considerations. 1. Most importantly, residents of Elyria, Swansea and Globeville will be displaced by EIS. Their communities, rich in history and tradition, will experience a fracture that will be life-changing. Many decades ago, they were confronted with the building of I-70. Due to I-70's air pollution, asthma and cardiovascular diseases are 40-50% higher in these areas than in the general Denver population. Particulate matter (the most harmful) will be increased by this new project, along with 30% more traffic. The city cannot give the owners the true value for their homes and businesses that will be destroyed. And real estate experts have predicted that property values will go down 24% if this project is completed. 2. Some think that EIS will help relieve traffic congestion on I-70. According to the CDOP the purpose of this project is not to relieve congestion. The purpose is to provide a reliable trip for people in the toll lanes. This leads me to think that those who can afford the toll price will have a more comfortable ride, while others experience the same old congestion problems. One thing to consider is that the new Light Rail, traveling from DIA to downtown, will alleviate quite a bit of congestion and the city can look at alternative modes of travel to deal with this issue. As a city, we can move ahead to safer environmental solutions, instead of encouraging more car traffic. 3. The Re-Route to I-270/76 Plan is one alternative. This plan would create less displacement, cost less, be beneficial to traffic coming-in from other cities and states and promote revitalization of businesses and communities along the route. In 2013, this plan was presented to the communities that would be most impacted by changes in I-70. However, the full re-route was not presented and valuable information was not available. It's time to repeat this effort and give the full picture. Visionary architects who support the re-route plan have given their perspectives, encouraging development of Elyria, Swansea and Globeville that will benefit the people: replacing the many dead-end streets that tend to divide the community, creating a new boulevard that will act as a main street/community connector and also serve as a bridge to downtown Denver. The potential and possibilities could be very exciting for Denver----and the surrounding communities.

all of the issues listed above involve negative impact for the future of the metro Denver area and represent outdated planning and transportation projections. Primary concern for me is the lack of appropriate health impact assessment and the future threat of flooding similar to the Phoenix experience this year. Building a highway below the water table at time of climate change and recent examples of seasonal flooding predicts massive inconvenience and expense. The idea of toll lanes financed by off shore transportation construction giants walks into conflicts of interest for now and the future.

I am in favor of removing I70 from Wadsworth to where I270 connects with I70 and widen the alternative route (I76/I270) that you have refused to consider. Make this a state of the art, high tech highway. And to boot, you can leave I70 alone while you do the construction on the alternative. The drive will be nightmarish during the construction. I drove TRex while it was under construction and am very aware of the issues that came with this project. That was a much smaller project than what this is projected to be. The alternative route seems to make too much sense to me. We will still only have 3 lanes in each direction with only 2 toll lanes in each. What is the expected time till this is undersized and we are right back where we are with traffic jams? I drive from Sheridan and I70 to Peoria and I70 everyday and have driven the alternative route. Both take about the same amount of time going either direction during both morning and evening rush hours. TREX is already bogged down during the rush hours so what can we expect to be different? I grew up in the Chaffee Park neighborhood and now live in the Berkeley neighborhood and both are impacted by I70. My family can recall the constuction of the highway and how it cut a swath through the neighborhood cutting off the shools for our families. Do justice and correct a 50 year old mistake. As one of the all time great movie lines says "build it and they will come" from Field of Dreams.

Debbie Ortega, Judy Montero and Albus Brooks support this plan to transfer public wealth to private toll road operators, further exterminating the Globeville and Elyria Swansea neighborhoods and threatening the other North Denver neighborhoods west of I-25 (where is Susan Shepherd on this issue)? I find that hard to believe, since they are all good Denver-loving people, but if they support this misguided plan, then someone is pulling the wool over their eyes. CDOT has never studied the reroute alternative. Not studying this reasonable alternative as part of a federally mandated EIS process is illegal, it is a violation of the National Environmental Policy Act, which was enacted to protect citizens from environmental racism. Shoving 10 freeway lanes through this neighborhood, with all of the attendant health impacts and displacement of residents, is environmental racism. Only private toll road operators will benefit from such an unconscionable disregard for the people. Lawmakers, it is on you to demand that the reroute alternative be studied as part of the EIS. Keep public infrastructure public! Make decisions for the future! If you support this terrible plan, you will be trading future, sustainable urban development rich with people for an unsustainable road full of cars. That future is not the stuff of Blueprint Denver, it is not the stuff of a citizenry that decided to back FasTracks. Don't screw up the legacy that Denver's people have worked so hard to leave to future generations. This is a community that will once again be impacted by a freeway to move people that need to be East or West without any respect for the children in the school and community. Families do not even want to let their children play outside now let alone with 10 lanes of fumes and harmful toxins they will breathe front and center. Let alone build them a playground on top of the freeway.....THIS MAKES NO SENSE. I doubt you would want your children or grandchildren affected this way. Community members have lived there most of their lives and now will be forced out and the amount of money they will get for their property will be hard for them to relocate. SHOW SOME RESPECT and create a boulevard...it has been proven to work in other communities around the world...it can work here also. People that need to drive freeway speeds can go to the North and use established highways for that. You can not convince me that when I 70 to the West of I 25 jams up when the lane numbers shrink that our neighborhoods in Council District 1 will not suffer Be sensible and do it right.....we will live with this decision for 50 plus years...do not let us down CDOT and the government. USER of I 70 and want it done RIGHT

Is the comment period ending at 11:59pm on October 31st or at 12am on October 31st?

There is not clarity where the deadline is concerned, which is confusing many people. If the deadline does not currently include the 24 hours on October 31st, I believe it should be extended one day. This lack of clarity, along with so much misinformation, given to the community by CDOT and uninformed city officials involved in the project is cause for the immediate halt of this project. CDOT has declined an invitations to community meetings and debates in an effort to avoid being asked questions from the public. In the community meetings, hosted by city officials, questions and concerns were not addressed because CDOT was not present. My own recorded interaction with Amy Ford (CDOT), along with every dealing with CDOT, leads me to believe that the public is to be blatantly lied to in order to push the expansion through.

The assessment produced by the American Planning Association (APA) reports a frightening lack of planning and research done by CDOT.

The ExecutiveSummary states that there will be no disproportionately high adverse effects on the community after mitigation efforts. As of today, there seems to have been almost no progress made in mitigation discussions. Given the severe negative impacts (health, safety, air pollution, further damage to the community, etc.) this proposed expansion is certain to inflict, it is your duty as human beings to oppose this expansion. CDOT's proposal is strongly opposed by health experts, environmental experts, civil engineers, traffic engineers, urban planners, architects, real estate experts, religious communities, and so many more who breathe the traffic caused polluted air. It is not too late to complete an honest study (no double-billing or miscalculations this time) of the I270/I76 reroute. Put politics aside and do what's right for the people. Thank you.

The Globeville, Elyria and Swansea communities have suffered enough. It is urgent that the DOT take the time to ensure the solutions requested in this petition. These communities deserve this, after the 50 years of disruption they have already suffered. Denver area faith leaders request that the Colorado Department of Transportation develop a solution that listens to the needs and wants of those who live in these neighborhoods. We seek an outcome that does not displace homes, families, or businesses in these neighborhoods. We seek a solution that demonstrably improves the health and wellness of residents beyond conditions that exist today that is, a solution that results in measurably better health conditions for residents, school children, workers and visitors to these neighborhoods. We request a solution that improves mobility and accessibility of residents of these neighborhoods, that does not continue to rely on fossil fuel technology, and provides instead new investments in transit, sidewalk completion, separation of railways, and bicycle connections. We request a solution that focuses foremost on improved connectivity within these neighborhoods and repairing the damage caused by locating I-70 here more than 50 years ago. We strongly affirm that investing in making these communities more complete, more vibrant, and healthier should be the city and state's priority, not damaging them further through this misguided proposal.

It is simply wrong to displace so many people, businesses and religious institutions to widen I-70. It is simply not worth the hardship, especially when you consider the expansion proposed plan will not "fix" the traffic problems. Giving up a lot for what? The proposed underground plan sounds good and looks good on paper BUT it will not be the vibrant, green parkway it is purported to be. Have you ever tried to bike, run or picnic by a highway? Need I say more? The underground section of the proposed expansion will flood period. Why is it that the City's response to increased traffic on other intercity corridors is not to widen streets, yet they consider it the best CDOT plan for I-70?!?!? What a disconnect. The traffic "plan" purported by the City of Denver Public Works/Transportation Department is to have people get out of their cars and use alternative transportation such as public transit, walking or cycling. Can you say pipe dream? The money slated for the I-70 project would be better spent on mass transit alternatives such as extending light rail service from Boulder to C-470, fixing the problem of the last mile to allow mass transit to be a viable option to get from point A to point B. I strongly oppose the proposed plan to widen I-70 and implore the City to diverted the I-70 traffic to I-270 and I-76, along the boundaries of the city, where it belongs.

We encourage all to support the Dennis Gallagher opinion in this matter; he cares deeply about Denver and it's residents. He has gone above and beyond in researching the best alternatives for this project. Do not disregard his input. We believe the people from Swansea and Elyria have taken the brunt of all this development for more than 40 years; enough is enough...

Please reconsider other alternatives to the I-70 east project. I request that CDOT do a SEIS on a full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Why was the full re-route that is on both I-270 and I-76 not studied as a part of the current I-70 east project SEIS? How can the best decision be made for the city of Denver, its communities, businesses and residents if all options are not fairly evaluated? Please show the world that Denver is a city that is known for cutting edge technologies, let us not go backwards. With Fastracks the East light rail will be operational in these exact areas within the next 2 years and the I-70 east expansion will not be necessary. Massive highways are not the answer to traffic and congestion. Houston and Los Angeles are no better for transportation than they were due to their expanded highways. Data indicates that the millennial generation continues to pursue alternatives over auto transportation such as mass transit, bicycling and walking. Future generations will likely continue this trend and as a result transportation by automobile will continue to decrease. More and more people are moving into the city to maintain a more sustainable, walk-able lifestyle and we should be focusing on growing metro Denver, not separating its communities. The home values in metro Denver continue to increase; people want to live in the city. By expanding I-70 east to 10 lanes, the neighborhoods of Globeville, Elyria and Swansea, Northeast Parkhill and Stapleton will be further separated than they already are. Do we really need the freeway practically three times the width compared to what we have now? Do we need four new toll lanes? How does this promote community, living in the city, encourage small business growth and benefit the people of Denver? This expansion is NOT in the best interest of the citizens of Denver and will only benefit those that are passing through. Are tourists our top priority? Please consider the long term impact that this project will have on these neighborhoods and their residents. This project will only create future issues for those residents that live West of I-25 in the neighborhoods of Sunnyside, Berkeley and Regis. Where will this expansion stop? Will we just make I-70 10 lanes wide through the Rocky Mountains? Create change, protect these neighborhoods, and LOVE Denver and its residents by looking at alternatives for this expansion project. You live in this city. Each of you made the choice to set down roots here, start families here, and begin a legacy here. Please keep in mind the reasons that contributed to that decision. We need to nourish the foundations that make it such a fantastic place to live; its people, schools, neighborhoods, culture and communities.

October 29, 2014 I am a native of northwest Denver, growing up north of I-70 at 48th and Lowell Blvd. For the last 37 years, I have lived at , which is very close to Berkeley Park. I was born in 1950 and throughout my childhood I watched as houses along the proposed route for I-70 were condemned and without any recourse, owners were offered substantially low values for their property. I then watched as the houses were either torn down or moved to new locations and neighbors moved away. Two beautiful northwest Denver parks, Rocky Mountain and Berkeley, were brutally decimated as each park lost much land on the north side of the parks. The lakes within the parks are much smaller now than before I-70 because the lakes were both filled in on the north sides with huge unsightly cement blocks, which became a breeding ground for rats and other vermin. Idyllic, quiet picnic areas were bulldozed to make room for I-70. Today, I-70 is still less than 1/2 block from each park and the walking paths within the parks that are used daily by hundreds of people. Semi trucks continually brought dirt in to build the interstate, piling it up higher and higher until there was a barrier between the people living on the north side of 48th Ave and the south side of 48th Ave. The neighborhood was totally and unequivocally divided FOREVER. As a teenager, I walked on this dirt that was piling up and watched my quiet neighborhood disappear before my eyes. Then I-70 opened, the pollution and noise from the traffic began to be heard 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days per year. This scenario was repeated in all the neighborhoods that I-70 gutted. Some of the hardest hit neighborhoods were the neighborhoods around the elevated portion of I-70. These neighborhoods need to be put back together by rerouting I-70 to the north of the city limits of Denver. The proposed alternate route would route the traffic onto I-76 and I-270 where there are no residential neighborhoods. Tear down the viaduct, Yes! It is falling apart and it is dangerous. But do not rebuild I-70 in the same place at ground level! Let the neighborhoods be reunited as quiet respectable areas to raise families and grow old, without the noise and pollution of an interstate. Do the right thing! Put people first!



CDOT staff, below is my comment on the SEIS. Hopefully you are aware that both your English and Spanish online comment forms are not working properly. I tried to submit them both ways. Because of this I hope you are considering an extension of the comment period. CDOT staff: Despite hours of study of the SEIS, I just scratched the surface of all the issues of the proposed "preferred alternative" for the I-70 expansion. Below are a listing of questions or comments I would like to be addressed. I have not put these in any particular order. 1) In section 106, Determination of Eligibility and Effects, I was struck by how many of the properties within the APE are considered eligible for historic designation according to the National Register in addition to a number of areas that had the potential to be historic districts. I found it disturbing the research on these properties was so sparse, and the decision to demolish these properties, or adversely affect them, was taken so lightly. I found a communication in volume 2 of the SEIS where Patrick Eidman, from Colorado Preservation Inc. also expressed his dissatisfaction with the survey inventory form, especially for a specific property where he disagreed with the assessment. The response from Dianna Litvak, who was involved with the survey, admitted all the site forms were deficient but feared "this opens a Pandora's box at this stage for the other historic properties that were surveyed" if an exception was made to further explore the history of this one property. With these admissions of deficiencies not only with one of your consulting agencies, but your staff, how can you accept this area of the SEIS is valid? One example of a major historic loss would be the Colonial Motel, which your own report states is a rare existing example of the 1940's motor lodge. The list of losses and adverse effects are too many to list here. In addition CDOT determined some of the proposed historic districts had too many contributing buildings removed, and non-contributing ones built, to be qualified for designation even though the National Register had determined them as eligible. Is CDOT suddenly an independent expert on historic designation? Speaking of independent consultants, for this area, CDOT said the Landmark Preservation Commission was a consulting partner. However, all the letters CDOT sent were to Denver Community Planning and Development (CPD) staff, not to the Landmark Preservation Commission (LPC). I attended an LPC mtg after the SEIS was completed and George Grause, CPD staff, told the LPC members there was no need for them to comment as the CPD staff had been involved and would do that for them! Despite my letter to the LPC, and Senator Lucia Guzman's plea for them to be involved, I have received no response from them that they will be formally commenting even though they are listed as one of the official consulting partners! Since Mayor Hancock and the Denver City Council gave their support to CDOT's preferred alternative long before the SEIS was completed, it is extremely doubtful anyone with the City of Denver will truly give an unbiased evaluation of the SEIS. The LPC should be directly asked by CDOT to study and comment on the SEIS before the final report is released. Another consulting partner for section 106 is History Colorado, who has as it's ultimate boss Gov. John Hickenlooper, the very person who appointed Don Hunt as head of CDOT. Considering that the below ground alternative had been REJECTED in 2008 as too environmentally risky, but was resurrected as the preferred choice by Mr Hunt, it is also doubtful this consulting agency is free to give an unbiased evaluation of the SEIS. Additionally, the Director of Historic Denver (another consulting partner) is Councilwoman Robb's daughter, one of the many council members who approved the Preferred Alternative again long before the SEIS was out. I'm sure you see the pattern here. There needs to be the inclusion of more historic experts who are independent of both the City and the State to be official consulting partners. Although Riverside Cemetery is a consulting partner, it's interest in more limited, and I believe Colorado Preservation Inc may no longer be a consulting partner. CDOT's determination that having the highway closer to many of these historically eligible homes and businesses by as much as 350 ft would have "no adverse effect" is hard to fathom and I believe false. I suppose that is how it was determined that the historic Lace House in Central City could be obstructed by the changes to the roads there. "No adverse effect" is in the eye of the beholder and CDOT is certainly turning a blind eye when it comes to all of these historic, yet un-designated, buildings and districts. 2) The SEIS addresses community outreach and involvement, yet most of the meetings I attended were in a format with an occasional brief presentation by CDOT staff or a city council person, but most times it was an informal look at pictures at a number of tables with the chance to ask questions of the staff. The majority of these meetings didn't have the opportunity to ask questions in front of others attending. I never saw anyone taking notes or did I ever get a report on what questions were asked of, and answered by, the staff or even who asked the questions. Some of the meetings were called on very short notice and were held in the middle of the day when most people couldn't attend. Often the number of City and/or CDOT staff far outnumbered the citizens, but was that distinction made to anyone, including the media? When the original I-70 was built there was a lawsuit filed because there were no transcripts of the public meetings. How can the outreach and the comments be evaluated if there is no official record? Isn't there a requirement for some kind of transcript? 3) The SEIS has a section for alternative analysis yet CDOT refuses to study the I-270/I-76 alternative while at the same time saying that "the reroute" was studied even though that was an entirely different "reroute", thus purposely misleading the public and the media. Many cities across the nation and even in other countries are either removing, or considering removing, their inner city highways. The process DEMANDS that all reasonable alternatives be studied, yet CDOT refuses to comply by even doing a formal study. Certainly this is a huge defect in the SEIS. 4) The Environmental Justice Act of 1994, if in effect when this highway was originally planned, would have put a stop to it. Why should a widening to triple the width be an exception to this law? 5) The Civil Rights Act of 1964 would also have prevented this highway from dissecting these neighborhoods, so again, why is the widening an exception? 6) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which insists that reasonable alternatives be considered would have eliminated the possibility of putting the highway where it is, so why can it be expanded there now? 7) The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 says that any Federally financed project must be carried out in the best overall public interest. How is the further disruption and division of these neighborhoods in the best interest for them and for a city that needs to have more housing close to the city core instead of tearing down some of the last affordable housing in the City? How is letting cars travel high speeds, or more likely in endless traffic jams since there will be even fewer exits, in the best interest of a public that wants clean air? How is taking a majority of the bridge funds for the entire state for this one project good for the people of Colorado? 8) The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policy of 1970 ensures assistance and affordable relocation for those who will be losing their properties, however, there is no independent agency to help those being approached by CDOT with offers to buy their properties, so these owners may not know they can negotiate with CDOT. Also, because the property values are so much lower in areas by the highway, these owners will not be able to buy a comparable home anywhere else in Denver. 9) There is no info on where 1.8 million yards of contaminated soil will go or the specifics on how it will be treated, or how the community will be protected from it. There is no analysis on the environmental impact of 50,000 to 75,000 round trips by loaders full of dirt, not to mention all the other polluting equipment used to expand the highway. Denver's 2020 Sustainability Goals mandates a decrease in energy consumption. How will this project meet these goals? 10) mitigation measures will never make up for the vast destruction that this project will do to these neighborhoods. No other neighborhood in the City would allow a highway to bisect their area. In fact at the same time the original I-70 was built there were plans to do one in Denver at 6th Ave, Downing and Quebec. All those were rejected because politically powerful people who lived near those stood up against them. This illustrates the lack of social justice in the decision to widen the highway in these neighborhoods. Highways don't belong in City neighborhoods, and they especially shouldn't be put there because of political reasons. All of the politicians who are willing to sacrifice the health and quality of life of people living in these neighborhoods so they can supposedly get back and forth from the airport 5 minutes faster, or so they can share in the profits of the toll road companies should be ashamed, or better yet forced to resign! As I said before, this just scratches the surface of the issues, but I would appreciate a response to all the questions and comments above. Also please confirm receipt of my email as being within the time frame for public comments. Thank you.

October 30, 2014

I-70 East EIS Team  
Colorado Department of Transportation  
contactus@I-70east.com

I-70 East EIS Team,

I would first and foremost like to congratulate your team on the I-70 East project. This is an immensely complex project that has been constructively and effectively analyzed over the past decade. There are many aspects of this project I find particularly beneficial and engaging that I believe you should be aware of.

A major strength of the I-70 East Environmental Impact Statement has been its determination in working with and including the public, local neighborhood residents, businesses and other stakeholders for more than a decade. I particularly appreciate the teams effort in working with the Swansea Elementary School and the inclination to help offset impacts the project is expected to have on the school. The Partial Cover Lowered Proposal with Managed Lanes seems to be the best option for this project as it solves the many issues with the imposing and

decaying 50-year-old viaduct. The four-acre, landscaped cover over the highway by Swansea Elementary School provides not only a connective device, playgrounds, plazas, outdoor classrooms and community gardens, but also creates potential for a landmark unique to this area, and for transportation in the state of Colorado.

Considering current congestion, future traffic forecasts on I-70 and the viaduct nearing the end of its useful life, I am in complete agreement that the No Action alternative should not be considered. I do have questions and concerns with the proposed action, however. In regard to the four-- acre, landscaped cover on the highway, it appears to me that certain wildlife species would eventually inhabit this area. Have there been any studies to examine potential species that may eventually inhabit this area? If so, has the study revealed any prospective endangered species, or potential future habitat this area may ultimately provide for them?

This is a major transportation project. This raises concern for the surrounding communities, more specifically during construction phases. How will communities including local businesses be affected in regard to noise levels and access to their homes? What time of year, and at what time during the day will the bulk of construction be happening? I

would like to express particular concern for the air quality during time of construction, and the possible effects it may pose for the local communities. In particular, what effects will this and the increased noise levels have on Swansea Elementary School?

Thank you for your time

Widening I-70 is a bad idea for many reasons. At my end of north Denver (near Federal and I-70), the areas east of Federal are really up and coming, and we even see major improvements in the economy and real estate on Federal itself. However, we are limited in expanding improvement of this beautiful historic urban area because of I-70, and an expansion of I-70 will only exacerbate this issue. What we want to see is better transportation options that compliment the urban lifestyle of the area, including pedestrian-friendly areas, bike lanes, trains, and buses. We want it to feel safe for our children to ride their bikes and play in the park. We don't want increased noise and car pollution just several blocks away.

The plan preferred by CDOT is the least-bad plan in all regards! CDOT is highly capable of building the lowered portion of I-70, and keep I-70 operational. This solution is very similar to the TREX project in south Denver. The plan is also least-bad in context to environmental and social justice. Build it!

A fantastic project to be realized through the next years, something that will enhance the area, the city of denver; much work to develop to include all research. The covered alternative looks appealing and would provide a great beauty effect; the old bridge if torn down would create better safe venues for traffic, concerns to noise and pollution still exist among the neighborhood but overall this is a positive project that will benefit all; the financing is still something that needs to be clarified and explained thoroughly.

I am writing to ask that CDOT take more time to study the impacts of its proposed expansion of I-70 in Denver, and to do an environmental impact study on what I consider to be a better alternative route. The re-routing of the highway via I-70 and I-76 seems a better alternative for a number of reasons. Why has the environmental impact study not included I-270 and I-76 already? The proposed expansion of I-70 would have its worst impact on neighborhoods that have been struggling with the existence of a major highway in their midst. CDOT holds the right-of-way needed to widen I-76 and I-270, and expanding the highway here would be possible without taking out any homes or businesses. The proposed area of expansion would impact eleven neighborhoods and displace a large number of families and businesses. The proposed expansion of I-70 in the Swansea and Elyria neighborhoods would make worse the existing problems of air and noise pollution right where there is an elementary school. The current proposal is to create a tunnel, requiring that tons of dirt be trucked out in the process. The area is a Superfund site, and the dirt is contaminated with cadmium, zinc, lead and arsenic. Where would the dirt be taken, and what kinds of air pollutants would people have to breathe, both workers and neighborhood residents? Once the tunnel was created, only artificial light would provide illumination for drivers, and, during the winter, icy roads would be extremely treacherous. Meanwhile, people on the parkway on top of the tunnel would be breathing terribly polluted air. Look at using I-270 and I-76. In all aspects it is a less costly alternative.

Please see the attached comments regarding the I-70 SDEIS. Hard copy to follow.

I support the alternative as it will reduce traffic and improve the surrounding neighborhoods

<p>Please consider re-routing I-70 instead of going ahead with the current plan to expand and bury part of the interstate. I-76 exists as a viable and much preferable alternative and would not present much of a detour at interstate driving speeds. I'm concerned about the impact of the current plan on our North Denver neighborhoods, safety issues with the tunnel in times of torrential rain, and the immense and unnecessary cost of putting an interstate underground. I strongly prefer rerouting to I-76. For the time being, please listen to your citizens and put the I-76 option on the table, give it equal weight with the current plan, and continue this process in a more democratic way. Thank you.</p>
<p>Please, please reconsider the proposal to expand and bury I70. This is NOT a reasonable solution now, and certainly not for the future when technology is likely to allow for very different traffic flows. The neighborhoods affected will be grossly and unfairly impacted AGAIN. I very much prefer that the alternative northern route be considered for and expansion. Thank you.</p>
<p>This is a great idea and would help improve the neighborhood. In addition the more park space we have the more beautiful the city is.</p>
<p>Increased lane sizes and lowering I-70 would be a big help to the city by reducing traffic congestion. Reducing traffic is essential as it wastes resources and increases the changes for a traffic accident.</p>
<p>I am in support of the proposed project. I feel that it will not only improve traffic flow, it will revitalize existing adjacent neighborhoods</p>
<p>I-70 has a nice direct route to DIA as it stands now. Rerouting north would be more expensive than simply adding lanes, disrupt a working system, and only benefit a few select people with a loud voice, and who probably live right next to the interstate. If you didn't anticipate expansion of a major expressway connecting nearly all of northern Colorado and an international transportation hub, you should have chosen your land purchases differently when you made them.</p>
<p>This would be great, and really improve my trips out to DIA</p>
<p>I'm not for re-routing I-70 unless there is a cost savings to do so. I would doubt that ! It would be great to widen the existing location of I-70 to lessen traffic problems coming and going to DIA.</p>
<p>American Planning Association comment concerning this I-70 remake. The impact your proposed plan will have on the community and economic development in the area is devastating. This planning did not use the state-of-the-art models available for determining many of the more desirable outcomes such as travel demand planning and other FOCUS more recent tools. The disruption to the city and the lack of true mobility planning is disgraceful within your "plan." PLEASE do not implement what you have on the board. It will devastate much of Denver.</p>
<p>I support the preliminarily identified preferred alternative. It's important to keep our urban core directly accessible from major highways, and it is also important to support continued revitalization of the adjoining neighborhoods. The proposed alternative helps both goals.</p>
<p>As a resident of Northwest Denver for more than 50 years, I am writing to voice concerns over the proposed changes to I-70 through Northwest Denver. There are numerous reasons to explore better options for the future of I70 ranging from financial impact to community benefits. Studies have been conducted indicating that this expansion is not needed. The State, City, Communities and all citizens should be fiscally responsible in adopting changes. If any funding is required from Colorado, I believe the Tabor amendment would require a vote of the people prior to incurring additional taxpayer costs. If traffic demands are such that this project isn't warranted then all parties have a requirement to be fiscally responsible in considering any future options for I-70. There are more economical alternatives and environmentally sound alternatives to the current proposed alternative listed on CDOT's website. Rerouting I-70 north of the city (around I-76 and/or 270) would not only be more economically feasible but save the area from a potentially devastating environmental hazard. The area currently proposed was previously a highly industrialized area and will likely uncover toxic waste from many years ago from a variety of industries such as metal smelting and refineries. Should this become a toxic hazard to the neighborhood, then it could endanger the entire Northwest Denver Neighborhoods and prove to cause endless delays and vastly more money to complete than is currently projected. CDOT seems to have moved forward with this proposed plan with thoughtless disregard to the number of schools impacted by this project. The only reason the Web site states "preferred alternative" do to lack of support for other proposals is because they have turned a deaf ear to the reasonable and rational viewpoints of those communities and citizens who do not favor the "preferred plan". Many other cities in this country have encountered similar highway issues and have elected to reroute a major highway around the city rather than cause the environmental hazard and chaos of construction through a densely populated and close knit community such as the Neighborhoods in Northwest Denver. I strongly urge CDOT to consider rerouting I 70 and presenting that proposal to the impacted Neighborhoods before making a final decision. Some communities and families in the Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea neighborhoods will be decimated by the current "preferred" proposal. These are businesses and families who have supported the community for years and possibly generations and will never regain businesses or homes if this "preferred" plan is implemented. I can not emphasize enough the health impact that will occur should CDOT move forward with this "preferred" plan. Serious environmental studies will indicate the adverse nature of this project being closely aligned to several schools in the corridor not to mention the impact on the entire community as particulate and toxic waste is disrupted and blown over the entire city but most noticeably over the many Northwest Denver neighborhoods. Environmental impact currently exists because of the location of I70 and will become worse if the current plan is implemented and increased density and usage of I70 occurs. Negative environmental impact not only has far reaching health concerns for Colorado impact but could impact the state financially if EPA standards are not maintained. Most of the environmental impact could be avoided by rerouting I70 north of the city. This option would also preserve communities and keep communities and businesses connected rather than further divide viable economic and neighborhood communities. Northwest Denver is historically relevant and has been a strong united community throughout the years. More than 50 years ago I70 divided many neighborhoods and communities. This is now an opportunity to correct what</p>

negatively impacted Northwest Denver 50 years ago. Please consider safer and more financially feasible alternatives prior to making a final decision on this project. It would be a travesty to move this project forward without conducting additional financial feasibility and environmental impact studies. It would be a tragedy to disrupt lives and businesses throughout this corridor and decimate communities. The State has performed well in other areas, let's not devastate our Cities and Communities. Please consider rerouting I-70 away from a densely populated area of the City and perform additional research in cities that have experienced similar highway issues. Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to an opportunity to comment further at public forums with well thought out and community inclusive proposals.

The widening of I-70 for such a short length is completely ridiculous! Isn't it enough that gentrification is taking over all of our neighborhoods, now add additional noise, pollution and displacement for families and businesses that have been there for years.... no. not progress. Invest in more public transportation and education on usage. Stop glorifying a bigger city by widening highways. The people who live in the neighborhoods that will be affected are life long denverites. They shouldn't have to pay for the increase of out of towners who want to take over historic neighborhoods and change them into the hideous condos that now litter NORTH DENVER! NO TO WIDENING THE I-70 CORRIDOR>

I think it's very shortsighted and expensive to move forward with the proposed trenched highway. Rerouting the highway would very likely be the equivalent to the revitalization of what we see in LoDo and Riverfront part. Those wheels were set in motion 20 years ago and we are now starting to see it pay off. The current elevated highway is terrible. Spending the money to widen and lower or rebuild the elevated that was originally proposed is worse. Could be better utilized there and to move the current I-70 highway to a parkway.

I think the I-70 expansion would benefit Denver. I support the approved plan as it currently stands and am not desire the new road to the north of I-70

fully support this work

I really like the proposed solution. It seems like a good balance of restoring the neighborhoods while providing the additional capacity I-70 needs without adversely affecting the transit system.

The alternative of rerouting I-70 to I-76 and 270 makes good economic sense. It will address future necessary repairs to those 2 roads while addressing the I-70 issues. Since the current plan is to widen I-70 only east of I-25, a huge bottleneck will be created which will be a traffic nightmare and create the potential for an increase in accidents which will further exacerbate the problem. It will be only a matter of time before there will be talk of the necessity to widen the road west of I-25. How many neighborhoods will that destroy and how many parks? This will significantly lower property values in the affected areas including Berkeley and Regis. I know from experience of trying to sell a house in an area impacted by noise and pollution from an interstate that had expanded will I owned the house. The value was \$150,000 to \$200,000 less than comparable houses less than 1/4 mile away. Soil samples taken in the yard on the highway side contained a higher level of lead than samples from the side protected from the road. (While fuel no longer contains lead there are other pollutants from vehicles.) I-76 and 270 are relatively undeveloped areas. Rerouting I-70 will have less of an impact on existing residential and commercial properties while opening up the area along the roads to future development appropriate for areas close to a major road. CDOT must do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes the I-270 and I-76 alternative.

I strongly believe and support the widening of the existing lanes and identified route is the correct decision. I sit in traffic jams daily through this area, and would strongly support the additional lanes! Thanks!!!

I am strongly opposed to the current plan for a number of reasons. First, I believe it is incredibly unfair to the communities that will be even further impacted by the highway expansion. I'm a Real Estate agent in the neighborhood and I know this is going to negatively impact housing values in the area which is a tragedy considering how much home values in these neighborhoods have struggled until recently. If this was a more affluent neighborhood I don't believe the city would attempt what it is currently doing. Not only does it impact the neighborhoods east of I-25, it is also impacting the neighborhoods west of I-25 especially in North Sunnyside, Berkeley and Regis. Buyers are hesitant to buy within 4 blocks of I-70 because nobody believes that to keep up with the traffic I-70 won't be expanded there someday too. I have yet to hear a valid reason why the alternative route of I-76 and 270 is not an option. Everyone who I have ever spoken to about this greatly prefers that option and believes it makes so much more sense. I would ask our elected officials to strongly consider other options before making a decision that could hurt thriving neighborhoods in Denver for years to come.

In planning the transportation needs for the future, wouldn't it be prudent to take into consideration the addition of the Commuter Rail to DIA, coming through Union Stn in 2016? The rail, which goes to DIA every 15 minutes is intended to reduce car traffic to DIA, exponentially, and with far greater reduction in pollution and noise, than an expansion of I-70 to accommodate MORE cars will. Also, please consider the massive influx of Millennial transplants that have been on the exodus to Denver and the large scale housing increase to accommodate them. This group of people is slated to utilize the increasingly updated developments in public transportation that has also been in the works in Denver, for this very reason. I'm curious as to why this is needed, considering these two points, let alone the slew of other negatives.

I-70 should have never been built where it was in the first place. Cities that have had their highway through the middle of town removed have improved vastly. I would imagine that the I-76, I-270 route would be much cheaper, easier and faster to build. Even 4-blocks away, I can hear I-70 in the background. Look at Boston's Big Dig for ways to waste money and create a maintenance nightmare.

The proposed widening of I-70 in this corridor will negatively impact the public health of residents. This proposal also negatively impacts the cohesion of neighborhoods, some still recovering from the initial construction of I-70. The loss of so much affordable housing stock in a tight real estate market is deplorable. And, not least is the impact on Swansea Elementary which is projected to be closed for up to 5 years. Swansea Elementary is the kind of neighborhood school that fosters a sense of community for all families. A disruption to this school would be difficult for the students and their parents.

<p>I live in Montbello and will be impacted by the widening of I-70 with the air quality concerns, hazardous materials, noise, truck traffic, flooding, &amp; crash recovery. The construction of the tunnel and deep trench will create contaminated soil &amp; dust particles, along with traffic emissions into the air which will add to the already high front range ozone levels. Poor air quality will greatly impact people's health in the three neighborhoods east of I-70. Driving conditions will be a nightmare during and after heavy rains which will create flooding &amp; crash recovery also in winter when cold and snow with icing occur. I like the option of moving the freeway onto I-76 and I-270 routes and converting the existing route to a six-lane tree-lined boulevard. This will give the commuters the ability to get to their destinations without adding to the air pollution in the adjacent neighborhoods. This option is a win for the neighborhoods with less traffic air pollution, less noise, and less health impacts for the community. It also is a win for Denver by improving the entrance into our city with a tree-lined boulevard creating less noise, congestion and emission pollution. This option will help keep our city cleaner and give a great impression for travelers and businesses visiting Denver. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the widening of the SDEIS and the alternative to re-route I-70 and convert the existing route to a tree-lined boulevard.</p>
<p>As a long-time Sunnyside resident, I STRONGLY object to I-70's expansion. Noise, air quality and construction congestion have plagued our community for long enough. To augment these nuisances with still more traffic would be outrageous. As one of the oldest neighborhoods in Denver, we take immense pride in maintaining the historical charm and quality of life which were the reasons we moved here. Please DO NOT violate our community integrity.</p>
<p>Trenching I-70 will require constant removal of water from the trench leaving it in risk of flooding and completely choking off the interstate. The construction necessary to trench such a massive area of highway will have extreme environmental impacts. Re-routing the through traffic into I-270 and I-76 will lessen the volume on the current I-70 corridor, reducing both local pollution and noise. Why didn't CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76? Why not use this opportunity to re-route and turn the current corridor into a boulevard with access to new businesses and parks along the route? What happens when the trenched corridor can't handle the future load? Add 20 more lanes!?! Adding more concrete is not a sustainable alternative.</p>
<p>Please consider rerouting I-70 and turning the section from Wadsworth to 270 into a boulevard similar to what other major cities across the nation have done. There are too many neighborhoods and schools impacted by the current highway. An expansion would only make things worse. A boulevard would connect neighborhoods, make the parks along the current I-70 route more enjoyable, and improve the air quality directly impacting the neighborhoods and schools. An expansion is NOT what Denver needs. We need more creative alternatives that put the quality of life of Denver's residents ahead of commuter traffic interests.</p>
<p>Hi - please consider re-routing I-70 to the I-76 corridor. This would allow you to take advantage of an existing commercial route without further dividing many neighborhoods - and just think of the real estate value to fund the new highway when you sell the land currently under I-70.</p>
<p>Please consider a better alternative without saying it's too late and rushing into some road project that Denver will regret. Do it right the 1st time.</p>
<p>NO NO NO NO NO to HOV, toll, pay, or other managed lanes. Traffic could flow if the entire corridor is used for all traffic. Toll and HOV lanes are a ludicrous waste of taxpayer money, we all pay for this road and should all have equal access to its entirety. A good example of wasting this resource is the middle two lanes of I-25 in North metro Denver. Those lanes are rarely used and the area they occupy would be much better used if they were open to all. Forcing taxpayers to pay per use of the highway they paid for is wrong and should not ever be done.</p>
<p>This is a terrible plan and better alternatives exist.</p>
<p>To Whom It May Concern: As a member of the teaching profession, and with elementary school-aged kids of my own who attend schools VERY close to the I-70 corridor, I am very much opposed to the widening of I-70. With 11 schools within the EPA impact zone and air &amp; noise pollution negatively impacting children's ability to learn in school as it is now, why would we want to increase pollution even further? These kids deserve better than this!! Is a school playground on top of the freeway a good idea? No! The trend is heading towards mass transit and many people today don't even want to own a car. The younger generation entering the work force today wants to live close to their jobs. Why is CDOT still planning based on the trends of the 50s &amp; 60s instead of today's trends? Why was the re-route on I-270 &amp; I-76 not studied as a part of this SEIS? It seems like a more cost-effective, community-minded, &amp; environmentally sound choice. The highway has divided our neighborhoods for long enough! It's time to make a change we can all be proud of by reconnecting our neighborhoods in a progressive way that will stand the test of time!</p>
<p>Seriously, almost 2B on this project? NO NO NO! Didn't we learn anything from T-Rex? And there are still so many problems!! I don't agree with this plan and would never support it!</p>
<p>CDOT's preferred alternative is based on the assumption that an expansion of I70 East is actually needed. In actuality, vehicle-miles traveled have been dropping for nearly 10 years! Traffic projects are consistently over-estimated. Refer to the report by Eric Sundquist of the State Smart Transportation Initiative. For an overview, see this article from the Washington Post that shows the pattern of overestimates of traffic flows: <a href="http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2014/01/22/the-us-government-keeps-predicting-well-drive-more-than-we-do-thats-a-problem/">http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2014/01/22/the-us-government-keeps-predicting-well-drive-more-than-we-do-thats-a-problem/</a> The amount of money that is being planned to spend on this project is an unnecessary travesty. Neither the draft EIS or the supplemental EIS have given the I76/I270 reroute any careful consideration. How much more density can the central Denver area handle? The only way to reasonably accommodate higher densities is not through wider highways, but rather smarter transportation. The major, car-dependent growth will occur in the outlying areas (around I76 and I270). That is where the tax revenues need to be spent. The right-of-way necessary for expansion along the alternate corridor is already owned by CDOT and the expansion there can be constructed at grade. Please provide a proper supplemental EIS that incorporates the I76/I270 reroute!</p>

I live in NE Denver and I have serious issues with has been proposed. Those of us who will impacted the most by this expansion need to have our voices heard. This expansion is not necessary. Denver does not need to increase traffic on I70 to ten lanes. My major concern is the air quality, noise, truck traffic, environmental issues, and especially the folks living closest to I70 will be greatly impacted by the expansion that's proposed. With the commuter rail to the airport opening hopefully in 2016, I'm doubtful that we will see the need for increased lanes -- tons of the traffic on I70 is people traveling to/from the airport. Also, people commuting downtown from East Denver and Aurora will have an opportunity to take the commuter rail. Decreasing traffic. My hope is instead to create a boulevard that's been suggested. That made the most since to me. Pushing for linking I70 and I270 so this kind of traffic goes around the city. Creating more lanes will further disconnect the communities north of I70 from the rest of Denver; if anything, we should be moving towards building communities with walkable, bike able, carpooling, and safe less noise and pollution. Let's do what is best for Denver in the long-term and be a sustainable city that doesn't depend upon and cater to cars. I heard this once: the only way to get people to change their behavior with their addiction to driving is to make traffic so horrendous that they start taking public transit because it will be quicker. So if we want the commuter rail to be successful expanding I70 will be counterintuitive. Yes, people will take the commuter rail but we want more people to take it. I hope you will reconsider this major decision that will have a major impact on the rest of the community. Please do not expand I70.

I am a life-long resident of North Denver's Globeville, Sunnyside, and Highland neighborhoods. I currently live in Globeville and am strongly opposed to Colorado Department of Transportation's preferred alternative for the I-70 East project, which proposes widening the highway and adding additional lanes between Washington and Quebec Streets in Denver, Colorado. Altogether, the widening of Interstate 70 would be a very bad deal for everyone. As a life-long resident of the area I am extremely fearful of the additional pollution that an expanded highway would bring. Growing up I was among several members of my family who suffered from asthma. At the present time my only child who resides with me in my house, which is located in the Globeville neighborhood, is suffering from a clinically-diagnosed asthma condition. I strongly suspect that our close proximity to I-70 is the likely cause of our family history, as none of my blood relatives who live or have grown up in other areas have ever experienced any kind of health issue related to a respiratory illness. To widen Interstate 70 would be a huge environmental injustice and not only to the residents who live in the area but also to the indigenous people in the country of Canada, where the majority of the oil-derived gasoline and diesel fuel supplies used by Americans are extracted from the ground. At the present time many of Canada's First Nations, who are subsistence hunters and fisherman, are experiencing a notable increase in cancer due to the mining of tar sands on their aboriginal land. America has a forced addiction to oil, and CDOT's intent to widen I-70 will only encourage people to continue to depend upon fossil fuels for their daily travels. CDOT apparently has no desire to do its part to help reduce our country's carbon footprint or reduce our nation's participation in the destruction of indigenous peoples' hunting and fishing grounds. The Globeville and Elyria-Swansea neighborhoods have been badly bisected by Interstate 70 several times over in the past. Where I live my home is isolated by the two interstates that run through the area. Me and my family have very few routes in and out of our portion of the neighborhood. As the crow flies, I am no more than a mile away from a grocery store. However, with I-70 and I-25, which both act as physical barriers, I am at least twice that distance from the closest food market, public library, and post office. With the widening of Interstate 70, many more people in the area will also be cut off from having reasonable accessibility to these basic necessities. My current and past experience with having CDOT as a neighbor has been very, very poor. I live about 20 yards from the I-25 and I-70 interchange. Along side the CDOT-owned alignment next to this interchange is an empty parcel of land that sits right across the street from my house. This parcel is unkempt, with noxious weeds and trees, and has been a popular place for illegal dumpers for the last 20+ years. Although I have contacted and have submitted numerous complaints to CDOT about these issues they have NEVER bothered to ever clean this lot or have bothered to take any action that would prevent the ongoing illegal dumping that frequently takes place there. Some of the waste that is dumped in these CDOT-owned brown-fields near my home is highly hazardous and includes containers with chemicals, tires, electronics, asbestos-coated concrete, wildlife carcasses, and construction debris possibly containing dangerous contaminants such as lead-based paint. It's obvious from this experience that CDOT does NOT care about the residents of Globeville. CDOT has been a very irresponsible neighbor. In summary I feel that Colorado Department of Transportation's preferred alternative for the I-70 East project would be a very bad deal for everyone. Highway expansions are very unnecessary in our advanced age and would only benefit the bank accounts of the already-wealthy who work in the oil and automotive production industries. A much better return-on-investment could come through the construction of a fixed guide way transportation system like a regional passenger rail line and/or from a reroute of Interstate 70 through the unincorporated areas of Adams County north of Denver. Thank you.

Dear Colorado Department of Transportation, I am against CDOT's plan to widen Interstate 70 in northeast Denver. Contrary to what's been said by CDOT, countless independent studies have proven that expanding highways and adding capacity to them can compromise the local air quality of the adjacent neighborhoods. My granddaughter and myself suffer from respiratory disease. More cars traveling through my area will likely result in more air particulates and will be an increased health risk to us. We ask that CDOT reverse their plan to widen Interstate 70 through northeast Denver.

I stand in opposition to CDOT's I-70 proposal. My reasons are diverse and many, but to summarize:

- the size of the proposed interstate improvements are inconsistent with current trends in automobile ownership and driving. The factors used to predict ever increasing traffic in decades to come are neither documented nor sourced on CDOT's website. Moreover, that Millennials, whose metro area this will be, are desirous of a lifestyle not dependent upon automobile ownership and driving, is a positive trend that should be encouraged by providing multi-modal transportation alternatives. To believe that the proposed improvements will serve the metro area for the next century is presumptuous at best and fallacious at worst. - interstates were never intended to cut through the urban core. The placement of the highway through the Globeville, Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods was a bad decision 50 odd years ago. The residents of these communities have long suffered ill effects--illness and shortened lifespans from air pollution, physical and economic separation from the larger community and its services, to name two. The displacement of over 50 families and businesses, which can not be replaced in today's economic conditions, and the digging of a trench in known environmental hazardous waste are unconscionable. The concept of "level of service" in any governmental endeavor should apply first to human beings. The right to breathe clean air trumps anyone's ability to get somewhere faster... - as if. Eight years after T-Rex, I-25, CDOT's model, remains congested and gridlocked at various times of the day. Why spend money to induce demand for highways and their ill effects and not safer, ecological methods to getting from Point A to B? Lowering the cost of light rail and public transportation would induce demand of another flavor, one that values the air we breathe and embraces the trends of the future. - lastly the premise that this 1.8 billion dollar (cough) project won't cost taxpayers a dime is disingenuous. Apparently, the residents and businesses displaced, the lifespans curtailed, the kids who can't play outside--these are costs CDOT does not consider as such. Furthermore, there are many examples of defaults in the privatization of highways--from such factors as less than expected revenue, false promises and failed business models. In all those cases, the losses have been and will be borne by taxpayers. Would you have support for this project if it was at the taxpayers' expense? To obfuscate and claim that this proposal is "free" and without risk, financial, moral, environmental or otherwise, is irresponsible and insulting. Please abandon this boondoggle.

I have been a resident of Globeville for 25 years in which I raised 3 children and have been very involved in many of the concerns and issues that need to be addressed. These concerns and issues will have a negative impact to these communities for many years to come. In my opinion, any widening of a highway will create adverse effects that will create adverse impacts on the poor, minority, disadvantaged people of GES and this is ethically unacceptable I believe the DSEIS is deficient because it gives insufficient weight to environmental justice concerns. I am writing these comments because I do not feel that CDOT will have residents and communities best interest in mind when they were developing the plan to expand i-70 to 10 lanes. I would compare this fight to David and Goliath; what chance do residents have if they don't speak up! It will continue to destroy and devastate this neighborhood as it makes its way through our communities. I want CDOT to look at all of the other alternatives to lessen the negative effects it will have on our communities. The DSEIS is deficient in that it has not considered and evaluated several possible mitigation factors that would have meaningful effect. The 2 most important are the option 1 the re-routing of I -70 over to I-270 to I-76 to I-25. By rerouting, big truck traffic it would reduce traffic by 40%. It would reduce the need for so many lanes. Option 2 is moving Swansea Elementary to a location either permanently or for duration of this highway project. If nothing is done I fear for the health and well being of those innocent children who are just trying to get an education, as this process moves forward. I want CDOT to follow the guidelines when it comes to Environmental Justice and make our communities better than it was before they started. I am concerned that residents do not know enough about this process to give opinions and comments on the DSEIS which would positively benefit the community. I want CDOT to remember that this community has suffered ever since I-70 was built through these neighborhoods and has been suffering its negative side effects ever since. I am concerned that the health and well-being of the residents who are being exposed to the cumulative negative effects that they are ingesting each and every day by living in these long suffering neighborhoods. I feel just because we live in a lower income community we should not allow CDOT to continue to move forward with its current plan without properly addressing mitigation. There are other possible actions that might reduce the potential bad impact on GES residents. I want CDOT to remember these neighborhoods have a long, deep and rich history and it should be respected. (1) The highway construction may destabilize the foundations of century-old homes that are near the construction site. The condition of foundations of all homes within two blocks of the freeway should be examined and evaluated both before and after the construction, with any adverse effects to be remedied at CDOT expense. I am concerned that CDOT will not pay home owners and businesses a fair price for their property or even to help them find residents affordable housing that allows them to remain in this neighborhood and not to be relocated to another neighborhood. I think that those homeowners' renters and business should have more support through this process so they don't get screwed by CDOT. As it is homes along highways have lower market value because we live along the highway. (2) There are many homes and businesses within 500 feet of the highway that should be equip with improved windows, doors, and HVAC systems. For homes and buildings within two blocks of the highway, these improvements should be provided by CDOT. It might also be that residents cannot afford to maintain these new systems so there should grants in place to help offset expenses. CDOT should be offering loans to these property owners who cannot adequately mitigate the air pollution/dust/noise impacts of the construction and increased degradation of air quality in GES. I would also like there to be air quality monitors place at the schools to be sure that our children are safe. It should be monitor before during and after this project. It would important to alert EPA when air quality in out of compliance before, during and after construction. As this project moves forward, we need to be aware that there are going to see a lot more health concerns especially asthma as well other health problems. The DSEIS is deficient in not having fully measured and evaluated the PM2.5 conditions in the project area. The cumulative effects of air pollution from the highway have been demonstrated to cause markedly worse health outcomes for the residents of GSE. CDOT airily dismisses these cumulative effects with references to improved mobility. But the people who live in GSE and get asthma or heart disease partly as a result of environmental damage caused by the freeway are not the same people who will benefit from the improvements in highway function. For some reason it doesn't seem to bother CDOT to build this highway right up against an elementary school, these poor kids have no chance to protect themselves and no one seems to

care enough to make a difference. It seems that CDOT is trying to buy off residents with the idea that by receiving new windows, doors and ventilation system etc. as part of the project. Could you compare doors, windows or HVAC to the health, safety and well being of those innocent children just trying to get an education? I would not feel comfortable with my children attending this school. Would you? As I understand it, the playground will have no defense from the dust and air pollution as the construction project moves forward. Our children are exposed to who knows what as they play on the playground each and every day. CDOT should place a greenhouse, or bubble like the Broncos have over the playground to protect them as they play at least for the duration of the construction, and possibly permanently. As for the quality of life for the residents, I think that CDOT has no clue what residents need to improve their community. This plan as it is will devastate these communities and I am offended that CDOT is trying to buy off residents with the promises of a park with amenities. Who in their right mind would believe that a park, built over an underground highway is an improvement to this community. I am scared for these communities and would not take my grandchildren to play there ever. I would like there to serious conversation when it comes to improving this community as there are several amenities that will improve our neighborhood such as a grocery or retail store, a regional recreation center, a new library and health/ mental center I am also concerned with the fact that CDOT is still trying convincing the public that the cap and cover was the communities Preferred Alternative. No residents that I've spoken to are excited about having the any contaminated soil, hazardous material being dug up and disturbed. No one seems to be discussing anything about how these hazardous materials are going to be handled before, during and after this project. As a resident I think that CDOT should have given out more information as to they know how these hazardous materials are going to be treated and removed as it will be dangerous contaminated materials more through our community for the duration of the project. I know that I never heard any public conversation about contaminated soil removal at CDOT I-70 meetings or any where else for that matter. The concept of the lid or cover over 800 linear feet of the preferred alternative is offered as mitigation for the bad proximity effect of I-70 East on Swansea and Elyria. But beyond simple construction of the concrete platform, CDOT promises nothing. The development of landscaping, public amenity, etc. is left for unknown because there is no present or solid assurance that any of this will actually occur. This CAP and cover should not be taken seriously as a meaningful mitigation. You should not be allowed to push this as a positive outcome because you are continuing to expose residents to the out coming exhaust pumped out for the underground highway. The fumes need to go somewhere, where do they go? Who will pay for it? Who will maintain it? This cap and cover will no anything positive for this community it will only increase the exposure to residents even more. Why would CDOT or anyone want to bring children to this park and possibly increase exposure to who knows what!

I am against the proposed I 70 expansion and instead support the I 270/I76 expansion option. It makes more sense and doesn't ruin neighborhoods or cost as much.

I strongly oppose CDOTs plan to expand I-70 through the middle of the Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods and part of Globeville. 1. It is a ridiculous plan that would spend 50% of Colorado's Bridge Enterprise Fund for nearly 30 years. How is this fiduciary responsible?? 2. Removing 90 or more businesses and homes. Ridiculous!! 3. Digging a 1.5 mile long trench that will be open to rain and blizzards where pumps and special drainage pipes will be needed to get rid of water. Sounds like a huge mess with lots of potential problems(pipes breaking, pumps not working, \$\$\$\$\$\$ wasted)!! 4. Making I-70 more than 3 times wider then it is now through neighborhoods. And by the Coliseum and other facilities used by the National Western. What a mess it would cause!! Way to expensive. 5. Removing exits and ramps needed for the area which has a lot of industry. Again, ridiculous!! 6. Increasing awful health issues in those neighborhoods where children already suffer from respiratory issues at levels that are almost 40% worse then the City on average and life expectancy is 3.5 yrs lower then for those in the rest of the city. 7. What happens to the bottleneck that will occur on I-70 west of I-25? 8. Who is behind CDOT pushing this?? Is it the company from India that is working on the electronic signs along Hwy 36? It is time the public is informed about the info that is being collected by this company. Even info on the blue tooth that is in cars will be collected by this foreign company. WHO IS WATCHING OUT FOR OUR COLORADO CITIZENS. FOREIGN COMPANIES SHOULD NOT BE HIRED FOR ANY GOVERNMENT JOBS/CONTRACTS. It makes me wonder who at CDOT is being paid 'under the table' by this or other companies. The much, much better option is expanding I-270 and I-36 and re-routing I-70 onto them. I understand that the state already owns property along I-270. It will be a lot less expensive then having to build a 1.5 mile trench, purchase homes and businesses and construct a drainage system to drain the trench when there is a blizzard or pouring rain. Expanding I-270 and I-36 would be much less expensive and would not ruin any neighborhoods.

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed widening and lowering of I70 between Tower Road and I25. As a north Denver resident who uses 170 and 176 daily, I believe there is enough evidence to suggest the widening and lowering of 170 is not advisable. I am specifically concerned about air quality, justice to the neighborhoods in the effected area and the amount of hazardous materials buried in the ground in that area. I have been stuck on I70 many mornings and evenings and believe the amount of traffic and pollution is harmful to the existing Swansea, Elyria, and Globeville neighborhoods along with Swansea Elementary. Widening and lowering the highway will only increase this pollution bringing more harm to these neighborhoods. These neighborhoods have faced pollution for many years, their property values have been effected. It is unfair to them as tax-paying members of our city to have to endure more pollution, years of construction and the demolition of 50+ homes. These folks are already living in one of the poorest areas of the city. Taking away their homes and adding more pollution is not worthy of our responsibility to our neighbors. I am concerned this area will become gentrified allowing the building of overpriced towers of apartments and condos that will be out of these neighbors price range. I believe the I70 viaduct needs to be torn down, streets rebuilt to re-join the neighborhoods and another plan developed to deal with traffic, including truck traffic. I76 is a possible alternative. I270 is a mess and needs upgrading, and there is plenty of land in that general area to build a highway around the city instead of through the city of Denver.



Dear Committee:

I am a resident of Denver and along the I-70 corridor near I-70 and Federal Blvd. I totally am OPPOSED to the plan presently before you. While it looks pretty it is not practical. Consider the daily congestion at the "mouse trap" and nothing is going to change only worsen. Remember the lanes leading into the new arrangement do not change. I see daily the present back up of I-70 eastbound every morning. Consider those few lanes do not widen and therefore having 10 lanes east of there is not practical. Consider what we went through in our neighborhood when the original I-70 was built. There was destruction of beautiful property, the lakes made smaller, and noise and pollution increased and CONTINUE UNTIL NOW. I also remember in our old home near 38th that the lowered 38th Avenue near Inca and Jason flooded every time there is a major rain storm. I do not see that this is going to change in the proposed lowering of I-70. Nor will the noise be contained, remember sounds rises like heat. There is no concern for clearing our the pollution from the cover portions and that only get worse with it being 10 lanes of cars. Consider that is still continues the traffic congestion of I-70 from our area from Sheridan through the project area. Therefore the alternate of moving I-70 from the I-76 interchange avoids all of the impacts of the present I-70 going through so many neighborhoods now and that alternate would bring some peace and quite back to our neighborhoods that we once had and no longer have with I-70. Please give additional consideration and not be so set in your opinion. It has been bad enough that those of us along the I-70 residential corridor where I live NEVER received any notices of other public hearings. I was fortunate to read this in the North Denver Tribune and thus my response Please give some consideration to us simple citizens instead of thinking your are the only ones who know our concerns when you do not live where we do. Thanking you in this matter.

The elevated 1-70 segment is now old and must be rebuilt. This project is a required maintenance project.

As a retired fire officer who has been aware of the dynamics of tunnel fires elsewhere, I am concerned about the potential for a disastrous fire following an accident in the covered portion of the highway. Fire protection must be designed into the ventilation of the structure to prevent a wind-driven, "blowtorch" effect from occurring. An automatic, continually monitored suppression system is a necessity as well since there is a potential for victims to be trapped and manual fire protection (the fire department) cannot be relied upon due to immediate congestion, not being on site and available due to other calls and potential bad weather. If this subject has been addressed in the document, I would appreciate being directed to the relevant location. Thank you.

I think this is a destrctive project for Denver. It represents a failed vision from the 1960s, when engineers rammed highways through out cities without regard. I'm ashamed to see that vision stuck in the minds of CDOT today. It seems no one at CDOT has read a book on transportation planning in decades. I oppose the proposed widening due to it's impact on local air pollution, concentrating more exhaust in an already poor population. It's morally appalling that we would rebuild a highway in a place most agree bore the negative impacts for decades. It is also quite a failure that you propose to fund this project with money you don't really have...dumb. I insist that you re-examine the "Re-route option", it is very compelling to everyone except your myopic highway engineers.

I only wish for the decision to recognize the social justice of a marginalized neighborhood over the needs of commuters. I love in NW Denver and work in Holly Square. I would gladly reroute my commute to the north and add time to my commute to better the health, well being and quality of life for those that have been forced to sacrifice all of this to shorten the commute of those of us that do not work in the neighborhoods we reside. It can be that simple if we think forward. Please put serious consideration into this option.

I urge those involved find an alternative in order to avoid the issues checked above in the 3 impacted Denver neighborhoods. Route the I-70 through a less residential area. It's the responsible thing to do for our city and the people of Swansea and Globeville.

To whom it may concern - At this point, I feel like all the arguments have been made as to why it's imperative to further explore options on re-routing I70. I don't understand what the real benefits are on rebuilding the stretch of I70 as it currently runs. It seems the impact to the adjacent neighborhoods with increased pollution and displacement of many long-time residents, overall costs involved, safety concern with having a lowered stretch of highway without sunlight in winter months, snow removal, increased traffic and bottleneaking during construction, etc. The list goes on and on, right? Does the benefit of the plan as written really outweigh the negative implications? I hope my comments don't come too late. I truly hope the alternatives will be explored in more depth. Personally, I would support a slightly longer commute to avoid the potential issues. I strongly believe that there is a better, more efficient and less costly way. I also welcome the option of having neighborhoods more integrated with a boulevard in lieu of the stretch of I70 that is in question. As a Denver native, I'm incredibly proud of our city and the growth that we've experienced. Isn't it possible to continue the development in a way that will take the best interest of the residents and commuters into consideration? Thank you for your time and consideration.

I do not like the depressed alternative. In this age of tight budgets-why would CDOT and governor Hickenlooper advocate spending over 1 Billion dollars extra over the viable reconstruction of the viaduct. There are a number of other congested areas that could use that money. Also, the tolls don't generate very much money in comparison to the cost of the project. Let's do gas taxes, or lets do tolls-but stop with the HPTe nonsense and P3. I think the governor's buddies are getting some special deals in smoke filled rooms-hundreds of millions being dealt-all in secret. It's all smoke and mirrors. There's no transparency. Low bid should win. No P3s. No "beauty contest" design builds. CDOT and Colorado's political leaders are failing in their mission of transportation. What other type of infrastructure would we allow to be oversubscribed 6 hours a day? What if the sewers or water systems were under capacity from 6 AM to 9AM and then 3 PM to 6 PM-would we tell people to "change their peak."? Is that acceptable? Why is it acceptable for roads. Lets spend that extra billion on other clogged roads, and leave the neighborhood as is. There will be 8 million people living here in 20 years. The roads are already clogged with 5.5 Million. Get cracking. It's an emergency-stop wasting money on depressed highways through industrial neighborhoods. You can't make a silk purse out of a dog food factory.

I'm writing to express my alarm at the proposed expansion of I-70 and the recent EIS that was conducted. I would like to ask that CDOT do a full SEIS on the reroute that includes 270 and 76. The expansion of I-70 would bring great environmental harm to the eleven residential neighborhoods that are along the proposed impacted corridor. Air quality and noise pollution would increase, and this would affect the education of students at Swansea Elementary, especially. I know from prior readings that child cancer and leukemia patients are more likely to live close to freeways. This expansion would be dangerous to our community of North Denver and would make innocent children suffer. Please do the EIS on the reroute including I270 and I76, which would be a better option overall. Thank you.

For more than 15 years, as part of my occupation, I drove from Arvada to NE Aurora several times monthly. Coming from the intersection of I-70 and Wadsworth and proceeding east on I-70 to Airport Road, I soon discovered that, at least during working hours, it was much faster to go I-76, hook up with I-270 and then merge onto I-70 just west of I-225, avoiding the elevated portion of I-70. In my humble opinion, improvements to this route seems like it would be a much less expensive and much more environmentally sound alternative to the below-grade option being touted by CDOT. This would also seem to have much less negative impact on the neighborhoods surrounding I-70 (Swansea, Elmira and Globeville) while allowing development of areas adjacent to I-76 and I-270.

Dear Sirs, I wish to encourage you to cease plans to widen or improve I-70 along its existing footprint and make your improvements along the I-270 path. My preferred alternative is to create a boulevard where I-70 is now. The neighborhoods of Swansea/Elyria and Globeville have been impacted by this for too many years with too many negative consequences. Widening I-70 only serves to further deteriorate these neighborhoods, lessen the quality of life of these residents and further subject the residents to air pollution and other toxins created by high levels of traffic. Building a schoolyard above such traffic and toxins only serves to decrease the health of the children attending. These neighborhoods deserve more consideration and a chance to heal physically and economically. Moving the highway north lessens the impact on residents nearby. Building a boulevard to direct neighborhood traffic through the area can serve to establish better connections between these areas and improve the health and quality of life for everyone in northeast Denver. Please choose the northern bypass of the current I-70 route and replace the existing highway with a boulevard.

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) is proposing to double the width of I-70 through north-central Denver by going from the current six lanes to ten. This proposal not only has serious consequences for the people of Denver and Colorado but is particularly detrimental to the people of the neighborhoods near the freeway: Globeville, Elyria and Swansea. Moreover it is unnecessary, is too expensive. 50 people will lose their homes, an elementary school will lose its playground and neighborhoods that are finally starting to see some property value increases will be completely wiped out.

I am a Realtor, taking communities & property values into account, I feel the re-routing of I-70 to I-76 & 270 makes the most sense. It would not affect any neighborhoods, would add potential development where I-70 was through the city, would have the least environmental impact. Just an all around great idea!!!

Hello,  
I have been to numerous meetings and presentations on some of the options concerning the I-70 corridor and am very concerned about the impact of the current plan to substantially widen I-70 and create an overpass connecting the two nearby neighborhoods. Based on everything I have heard and read, I believe this will cause more problems than solve problems, and am in favor of rerouting the traffic to the I76 corridor. The current proposal cannot help but result in bottlenecks due to the variation in number of lanes on I70, I am concerned about the potential weather-related and environmental problems that may occur with the underground segment of the highway, and as a Realtor and nearby property owner I fear the impact on housing, health and safety in the area. I strongly urge you to reconsider this issue.  
Thanks

I think CDOT and the City and County of Denver are being extremely short sided in sticking with the current location. I was 16 when the current edifice was started and I remember watching the construction from my grandparents house at 47th and Gaylord. It split the neighborhood and has spewed pollution on the residents ever since. It never should have been built where it is, bifurcating the City, splitting neighborhoods. Now CDOT seems hell bent on making the same mistake. Best practices, according to city planners and architects, are to revitalize city centers. Rerouting the highway to the north is the best alternative. The arguments against the rerouting do not hold water. Not sure why the Hancock administration is so supportive. I suppose there's some good reason, like corporate/developer money greasing the way.

To whom it may concern, Recently I learned about the recommendations made by the city counsel to lesson the burden of negative environmental and social impacts of the preferred alternative. The suggestions made were not only grossly inadequate, but highlight the disregard for basic human rights and health equity within this plan. I deeply urge C-DOT to provide accurate and transparent information regarding their preferred alternative, and offer to the public an actual accurate and transparent plan for the proposed reroute of i-70 (using 76 & 270). As a Pubic Health Nurse living in the Clayton neighborhood, I am deeply concerned about the health and wellness of all people in our community. One suggestion from the city counsel is to have kids from the neighborhood attend a different school during the construction period. Yet, this does not address the fact that these kids will still be exposed when at home and their caregivers will continually be exposed to hazardous particulates. Another suggestion is to have a recreation area with reinforced windows for kids to have a safe place to play. That some children will have to enter a building for safe play while others in our city can have the same experience by just leaving their house is injustice in its highest form with negative sequellae that will follow these limited children for their entire lives. Similar recommendations (reinforced windows) were made for schools within the environmental impact zone. Finally, city counsel recommended that once the preferred alternative has been implemented and currently standing houses in that zone removed, houses within the new environmental impact zone (1/2 mile within the border) will be offered the opportunity to leave the area. It is not difficult to see that this will further segment these neighborhoods to the north. I strongly urge that we look at the long term growth of the city over the next 50-100 years. C-DOT is providing us with a preferred alternative, but how can it be called a preferred alternative when no other options were vetted with the same care and marketing this one has? It should more correctly be named "the only alternative" as it has been offered to the city. Please vet the reroute using 76 and 270 with the same care that you have done with this one before moving on a plan that will have continued negative impacts on our city for the next century and beyond.

Looking at all the options available seems to be the logical and SMART thing to do. Health issues should be NUMBER ONE. Re-routing I-70 onto a widened and improved I-270 and I-76 appears that it would effectively address I-70's traffic congestion on both sides of I-25 for half the money of the current preferred alternative and impact zero neighborhoods. The non-local traffic would drive 1.8 miles farther, but get to their destinations faster & use less fuel, avoiding the bottleneck CDOT is about to create. The current six lanes of I-70 would remain six lanes, but as a boulevard which is expected to handle traffic better, especially during rush hour. In total, there would be much greater capacity and 12 I-70 adjacent neighborhoods would be cleaner & safer while creating wonderful economic development opportunities for large sections of undeveloped Adams County.

I am a concerned citizen of northwest Denver, and a health professional. In both roles I oppose the development of I70 east as currently proposed. 1. Current residents of the impacted communities should take precedence over those who are simply passing through. 2. There is a valid and cheaper alternative that will not impact residential areas. This is the I270 and I76 reroute. 3. As a certified asthma educator and pediatric advanced practice nurse, I am very concerned about the impact of the increased pollution on children in these neighborhood homes and schools. It is well-documented that vehicle exhaust is a factor in the development of asthma and other respiratory illnesses. 4. This plan will not solve any traffic issues and will only create a bottleneck further west on I70. 5. It costs more than the alternative will.

The proposed changes, make sense as long as environmental and the local community concerns are addressed satisfactorily. No Tolls!!!

I am writing to express my deepest concern over the plans presented to widen the I 70 highway system through the middle of Denver. The expansion will do more harm at a greater cost than any perceived benefit that could come of it. I am sure that CDOT would much rather have private corporations get involved with these kinds of projects to alleviate the responsibility from the State agency, however that is what CDOT was created for and the residents of Colorado expect CDOT to fulfill its responsibilities.

Based on what we have read and our personal experience with the corridors discussed, we think that I-70 would best be rerouted over the already existing I-270-I-76 corridor. More room for expansion and less expensive in the long run. Thank you!

As a property owner sitting between I-76 and I-70 I feel like I have a valuable opinion to offer since my home will be impacted by either a widening of the current I-70 or a rerouting of I-70 and widening of I-76. Since I will be directly impacted in either case, which would I choose? Without going too deeply into the studies I have read and heard about (and have heard are deeply flawed, incomplete or worse), it seems obvious to even a casual observer that rerouting I-70 through I-76 will cost less money, be easier to build and maintain, have a lower environmental impact and lower property impact for homeowners. The area of I-76 that would be impacted is already far more industrial and far less residential. Why not contain the PROFOUNDLY negative environmental impacts that come with building and maintaining such a highway to a smaller area and one that would impact fewer families? The parents and children in this area would appreciate not breathing poison every day. Why not build in such a way that the impact to existing traffic is minimized by not needing to dismantle and recreate an existing highway? The drivers along I-70 will thank you. How does it benefit the neighborhoods that exist along the current corridor to have the highway expanded and how does it harm the plan, traffic, businesses or neighborhoods along the rerouted corridor? I think the answer to both is "minimally". This is an observation of a Denver resident who lives smack in the middle of both highways and who will acutely feel the impacts of either plan. I understand that this project is for the benefit of many others besides me and mine is not the only voice that counts. But I fail to see how even those not directly impacted by this project could find fault with rerouting I-70 through I-76.

Several different studies have been conducted by experts showing that a reroute through non-residential I-76/I-270 and changing current I-70 from Central Park to Wadsworth into a boulevard would cost less, distribute traffic evenly, connect neighborhoods, improve air quality drastically, etc. I advocate that CDOT actually study this option. Please reconsider the study of a 270/76 reroute. Additionally, surveys from Globeville-Elyria-Swansea show overwhelming opposition to CDOT's plan.

CDOT, I am a native of Colorado and long time resident of North City Park and attended the meeting at Bruce Randolph Middle School regarding the proposed I-70 Highway project. CDOT was not in attendance( not one representative). Clearly the decisions being made and push forward on this project is due to the make-up of the neighborhood. I do not support such a project based on race/discrimination/economics. I support better communication with all neighborhoods and seeking alternative plans for this project. Of course, you have already decided you would move forward no matter what- so many benefit off the demise of others. Its not a good plan, we need more answers and it is racist at best. I do believe this might be against the law according to Tittle 6 mandates. Thank you

This will definitely improve traffic flow into and through Denver.

Dear Sir or Madam, I find it disturbing our roads are becoming more and more privately owned. I am not a huge fan of privately owned roadways, or anything that has to do with public access. The last few decades have shown corporate greed is commonplace. This project I can only guess will become a huge money maker for whatever company controls the toll lanes to the point consumers will be gouged. I personally will not use the toll lanes unless it is absolutely necessary. I will find other routes to use. Again, I am guessing a good portion of the population will agree with me. This will create more traffic else where on the road ways through the nearby neighborhoods thereby increasing the danger factor to the residents of those neighborhoods. Would not a better alternative be to widen I-270 and I-76 be a less expensive and better option? There would be no need for toll lanes if these roads were widened. You could even go so far as to say heavy truck traffic must use the improved I-76 and I-270 roadways to circle around the city. I also must say I am disappointed with CDot's performance of road projects in general. It is extremely annoying to sit and wait on I-70 for at least 1/2 hour because of paving operations. What happened to night time work? When 285 was improved through the Englewood/Sheridan area I cannot believe CDot closed all but one lane during the daytime creating a huge traffic nightmare. I understand due to the tax cuts during the Bush years less tax revenue is available for roadways. There has to be other ways to handle this besides creating toll roads which is an actual tax on those that use them. Thank you for your time.

My concern is with future expansion of I-70 west of I-25 which will ultimately be required. The widening of I-70 using the current CDOT preferred alternate will leave no alternative but to widen the current I-70 alignment through NW Denver which was a terrible mistake in the 1960's. To make this same mistake again is unconscionable and shows no regard for lessons that should have been learned. Please do not cast the die that will cause economic and community injustice in the future to NW Denver for generations to come. Further study of the northern alternate using I-76 is a must even though more time and money will be spent. If 2 billion dollars are about to be spent it better be for the right alternative.

I support the Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative. I also appreciate all of the telephone town halls that, combined with other outreach, have allowed me to stay informed on this exciting project over the years.

I am concerned about the total budget size of this project. It appears to be fiscally irresponsible spending from a taxpayer perspective, especially when the re-route appears it will cost about half as much while addressing I-70 congestion issues on BOTH sides of I-25, not just the east side. I would like to see CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Thank you in advance

It is my understanding that the Cover located near Swansea Elementary School is one of several means of mitigation for the Environmental Justice impacts to the Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods. As a means of mitigation for the I-70 East project, Denver City council members have indicated that the cover needs to be owned and maintained in perpetuity by CDOT, and that the City does not intend nor have they budgeted for the ownership and ongoing maintenance of this project component. In Section 3.7.3 Partial Cover Lowered Alternative, it is stated that CDOT is working with Denver and various other stakeholders to develop agreements for ownership and maintenance of the cover, which will be finalized before construction begins. My questions are first, as a mitigation element is CDOT required to own and maintain the cover and second, if an agreement is allowed but can not be agreed to, what will happen to the cover, will it be eliminated from the project, and if so what new mitigation element(s) will take its place.

I am a homeowner in a future potentially impacted area west of I25. The I270 and I76 expansion will be most cost effective and does not remove ANY homes or businesses in the process. Why was the full re-route on both sides of these highways not studied? Please do the right thing for the neighborhoods that will ultimately be impacted and altered forever by shortsightedness. Look to the future and make the RIGHT decision. Thank you

I agree that re-routing I-70 or creating a bypass using the Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative would be a better use of funds. This would not only truly address the congestion on I-70 but help improve the quality of life for all residences and daily commuters along I-70.

Please reconsider other alternatives to the I-70 east project. I request that CDOT do a SEIS on a full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Why was the full re-route that is on both I-270 and I-76 not studied as a part of the current I-70 east project SEIS? By expanding I-70 east to 10 lanes, the neighborhoods of Globeville, Elyria and Swansea, Northeast Parkhill and Stapleton will be further separated then they already are. Do we really need the freeway practically three times the width compared to what we have now? Do we need four new toll lanes? How does this promote community, encourage small business growth and benefit the people of Denver? Please consider the long term impact that this project will have on these neighborhoods and their residents. The noise and air quality pollution will have detrimental effects on the residents that live within close proximity to this expansion. This project will only create future issues for those residents that live West of I-25 in the neighborhoods of Sunnyside, Berkeley and Regis. Where will this expansion stop?

I-70 as a boulevard with interstate traffic moved to I-76 and I-270 would greatly improve the health and cohesiveness of the city. Larger freeways intersecting the city are not needed whereas beltways make more sense. My vote is for the expansion of I-76 and I-270 and NOT I-70.

I strongly support the proposed plan by CDOT to maintain the current routing of I-70. I feel that it will help re-establish the existing neighborhoods while not destroying the current corridor, harming business and residents who rely on it for our daily commute. Thanks

In light of the many difficulties highlighted by the report, I think it is only appropriate to do a similar study of the full re-route using I-76 and I-270. Only then can you compare. I used to work in the Globeville/Swansea neighborhood and know of the environmental impacts they have already suffered with superfund sites and the highway already. The option currently under consideration would never happen if it affected a wealthier community, but poor Globeville/Swansea needs to be heard too! Isn't it true that the alternative reroute would have much less impact on neighborhoods? I also just don't understand the logic of so many lanes in that section without widening it west of I25 too. If CDOT has plans for that, they need to be honest about it. If not, then it doesn't seem like they've truly thought through it. Besides, doesn't widening 76 and 270 first make more sense than trying to work on 70 while it's still open? Sounds like a traffic nightmare for years!

I support the reroute of I-70 to I-270. I believe that the viaduct should be removed and that the grid system be reconnected. This is the only solution that will end the environmental and social injustice that was caused by the creation of I-70. The overall wellbeing of these neighborhoods should be paramount not economic gain from through traffic.

Hello:  
I live in an area that will be impacted by the I-70 expansion. I understand that to a hammer everything looks like a nail and that to CDOT everything is about roads, but that thinking is regressive even antiquated. America needs to and must change to multi-modal transportation and innovative systems. The I-70 expansion is the 'same old, same old' way of dealing with traffic and it does not work. It will create more traffic, more congestion, more pollution and more negative environmental impact in residential neighborhoods leaving the mess for future generations to solve and clean-up. What is the point of that? Why can't we imagine... just imagine a transit systems that will take us through the next 100 years rather than the next 20. Build the city and state that will represent the future of multi-modal transit that all forward thinking cities and states are looking to build. I will not continue to support road building without thought given to livability and sustainability. I will continue to work with groups like Unite North Metro Denver that fight CDOT when they decide to add to the mess we already have rather than think of the future beyond immediate need to a 'system' that will endure for generations. I believe we can do the 'smart' thing and through my work with TBD Colorado I know that the majority of Coloradans do NOT want to build transit that continues what we have without thought to a more viable system of multiple transit alternatives. Thank you for your time.

If this project continues as planned then the expansion of I-70 must be limited to no more than 200ft. 10 lanes makes no sense given the changing driving patterns in Denver.

The costs of this project makes it seem unfeasible to me. I do not support the use of the majority of the bridge enterprise fund over the coming decade. It is unfair for Denver to receive a Cadillac highway, while the rest of the state has deteriorating infrastructure.

Please monitor small pm emissions at reroute truck traffic to I-270. This will greatly improve the air quality in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Managed lanes should be operated by CDOT not contracted out to a third party.

Rerouting I-70 would be a better choice for the health of our city and community. Rerouting I-70 via I-76/ I-270 will effect less people and will also have a greater economical benefit than this expansion through the heart of a high population area. Other cities have had great success with removing highways from the heart of the their cities. The cost of rerouting will cost far less per mile than the projected cost of this 10 lane lap pool.

#### Section 10.2 Onsite drainage

What safeguards are being considered to protect public/private property and manage rain events that exceed the current proposed 100 year volume and the potential failure of outfall pump facilities needed to get the water over the Burlington Irrigation Canal and into the South Platte River?

Because the runoff from the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative will be generated and collected in an impervious "bathtub" it is highly likely that the runoff will have higher levels of and a broader array of contaminants. What considerations are being made to ensure that prior to being discharged into the South Platte River, this highly contaminated water is "cleaned" to an acceptable level as defined by the regulating agency of the Waters of the U.S.?

Section 3.9 notes that Capital costs include earthwork, utility relocation, roadway and structure construction and right-of-way costs, but does it include mitigation costs and environmental costs such as those to handle contaminated soils and/or water?

Managed lanes should be operated by CDOT not contracted out to a third party.

I support the planned improvements to storm water management in the area of study and encourage further cooperation with Denver to leverage resources.

CDOT's proposal to expand the highway along its current route represents government arrogance and irresponsibility at their very worst. The result would be pointless destruction of existing neighborhoods and an inefficient route for traffic. A far more logical plan would be to redirect the highway along the existing routes of I-270 and I-76. It is time to remember that you, the government, work for us, the people. Start listening!

The rerouting of I70 north would cause more harm than good. Air pollution would go up because of more traffic on the already congested roads north of I70, whereas expanding I70 would reduce congestion as well as pollution from the reduced drive time along this route. The cost of expanding versus rerouting traffic would be significantly less, as well as less of a headache to deal with. As a person who frequents DIA, expanding the interstate in this location would reduce much of the headache as this area always has the most traffic.

Within Chapter 2: Purpose and Need, paragraph 2.1, there is a statement about the I-70 East Corridor serving as a multi-modal interstate freeway. What are the other modes of transportation that are being accommodated and/or planned for in this corridor.

Paragraph 2.1 also states that this corridor is to serve regional and statewide trips, but since the interstate bisects many different neighborhoods and cities why isn't local traffic being counted and considered as a more significant user of this facility. In a letter from Don Hunt to Dennis Gallagher dated July 17, 2014, Mr. Hunt notes that 57% of the trips along I-70 are considered local, having either their origin, destination or both within the study area, and the remaining 43% of the trips on I-70 neither beginning or ending within the boundary area.

Paragraph 2.1 introduces the other transportation options that are parallel to the I-70 corridor and Paragraph 2.2 discusses transportation modeling which is used to make decisions about future transportation systems. Specifically, what other modes of transportation have been included within the I-70 modeling and forecasting, and what modal split percentages have been used as the foundation for the ultimate traffic volumes expected within the Project limits.

I agree with all of the comments opposing the I-70 "trench" plan. It is incredibly poor use of tax dollars and a seriously ill-advised pollution producer. But the plan is an even greater disaster for the state financial impact. Moving people out of their homes, constructing a pit that will have delays, ongoing weather dangers, toxin problems, and destroying many neighborhoods should never happen. The alternative expansion of I-270 and I-76 is so attractive financially and environmentally. It causes so little impact to people and doesn't include Superfund dump material. Why isn't CDOT using land it already owns? Additionally, the Brighton Blvd gateway to downtown would add an excellent opportunity to open up access to the businesses downtown and mitigate I-25 congestion. I-70 trench plan would be an embarrassment to the state of Colorado.

As a resident of North Denver and Colorado tax payer, I vehemently oppose the expansion of I-70 through the neighborhood. There reasons checked above are some of my concerns, as I live just north of I-70 and already experience the noise from truck traffic and pollution. CDOT's goal should be to unite neighborhoods rather than further separate them and disadvantage them with the expansion of the highway. Putting I 70 in the trench is not only foolish but a very dangerous idea. I support a reroute of I 70 around the city using I 270 and connecting to I 76. This is a modern-day solution to the expansion of I 70. Thank you for reading my comments.

I support the preferred alternative of a below ground highway along the present I-70 route, but have a concern regarding the partial cover. As was the case with the former Stapleton airport tunnels, the cover could have a detrimental effect upon traffic flow. People tend to unnecessarily slow; thereby creating a bottle neck as well as an increase in the chances for accidents that could offset the benefits of a wider road through that stretch. Aside from the cover, the preferred alternative will be a tremendous improvement over the present configuration.

We come to Denver several times a year to visit family. I70 is a nightmare and we avoid it if at all possible. Any improvements would be appreciated!!

Re-routing I-70 onto a widened and improved I-270 and I-76 appears that it would effectively address I-70's traffic congestion on both sides of I-25 for half the money of the current preferred alternative and impact zero neighborhoods. The non-local traffic would drive 1.8 miles farther, but get to their destinations faster & use less fuel, avoiding the bottleneck CDOT is about to create. The current six lanes of I-70 would remain six lanes, but as a boulevard which is expected to handle traffic better, especially during rush hour. In total, there would be much greater capacity and 12 I-70 adjacent neighborhoods would be cleaner & safer while creating wonderful economic development opportunities for large sections of undeveloped Adams County. Shipping Colorado monies to foreign and out of state interests is not in Colorado's best interest.

Paragraph 3.5 discusses why the I-270/76 reroute was eliminated from consideration in the 2008 and the 2014 DEIS. It appears to me that the Re-route meets and exceeds the purpose and need of the I-70 East project.

The first bullet point in this section discusses how moving I-70 would encourage local users to utilize local roads and not the interstate freeway to reach their destinations. I feel this meets the purpose and need of reducing congestion on I-70, in a letter from Don Hunt to Dennis Gallagher dated July 17, 2014, Mr. Hunt notes that 57% of the trips along I-70 are considered local, having either their origin, destination or both within the study area, and the remaining 43% of the trips on I-70 neither beginning or ending within the boundary area. Based on that, then if more vehicles are using 46th Avenue wouldn't that be reducing traffic/congestion on I-70? If given an option, I believe these local users would prefer lower speed local roads with multiple connectivity options over the high speed limited access interstate to get from one local place to another. With a boulevard or other local road in the place of I-70, it seems to me that it would improve safety, access and mobility for the neighborhoods. Can you please provide an equal comparison of the safety, access and mobility issues as related to the partial cover lowered alternative and an at-grade boulevard. Additionally, I would like a breakdown of the number of barrier free routes for bicyclists and pedestrians as they move north to south and south to north across the partial cover lowered alternative and an at-grade boulevard. I ask for these because if these issues/reasons are part of the justification for the elimination of the re-route option, then these analyses must have been done and should be available for public review.

The second bullet points to traffic analysis as a reason for elimination. So interested citizens can better understand the methodology used, please make public the traffic forecast model(s), including trip generations, trip distribution, modal splits, route assignments and all other data used in the generation, analysis and forecasting. I ask for this information because according to data publicly available through Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) and the City & County of Denver, roadways with the same designation (arterials) and similar cross sections are today carrying comparable amounts of traffic as projected for 2035. For instance the data shows that 1st Ave: w/o N University Blvd in October 2009 had an average daily traffic count of 44,472 and Speer Blvd: nw/o Stout St. in April 2010 had an average daily traffic count of 34,460. Based on Blueprint Denver, the Denver Street Function/Classification Definition Criteria states that Arterial Streets will accommodate average daily traffic volumes of 20,000 or greater...and it appears that 46th Ave is designated as an arterial. Again, it seems that not enough information is provided for an educated resident to understand the logic here.

Bullet point three talks about the heavy truck traffic that would be using 46th Avenue, but isn't it true because of the limited access nature of the interstate freeway, that the same delivery trucks, other large vehicles and local traffic will still have to use 46th Ave on the north and south sides of the partial cover lowered alternative to access the industrial areas and businesses near the exiting I-70. Please provide for public review a couple route maps using the partial cover lowered alternative and an at-grade boulevard showing how delivery trucks and other large vehicles will provide delivery service to a business located at 4560 Columbine Street, Denver with an origination point on South I-25.

The out-of-direction travel discussed in bullet point four doesn't take into consideration that with an average speed of 55 mph, the additional time added to travel times for traffic heading west of I-25 is only 1.83 minutes and the additional travel time for vehicles heading south on I-25 is just 3.6 minutes, which to me seems better than sitting in traffic at the I-25 bottle neck for 5, 10 or 15 mins.

There might not be multiple highway east-west routes as pointed out in bullet point five, but with the re-route and an at-grade boulevard the east-west route choices have just been doubled or possible even tripled. With proper design, the boulevard will provide even better emergency response times to the neighborhoods and adjacent industrial areas, since roadway connectivity is increased by a factor of at least 10 times and the physical and visual barriers as proposed with the preferred alternative have been removed or decreased.

The only comment or request I have for bullet point six is, please provide for public review a detailed project construction cost estimate for the I-270/I-76 Reroute alternative. It seems to me that even with 12 miles of major highway widening for an at-grade interstate with adequate right-of-way would be significantly less than a 12 mile widening where a significant portion of the freeway is subterranean with a two and a half block cover and requires the acquisition of a significant amount of right-of-way land.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have been on the edge of this issue, reading newspaper reports and scanning online information. As a result of those reviews I did not feel that the planned 10 lane expansion was well explained; the northern loop option did not seem to be seriously explored; nor were the concerns of community members addressed in any meaningful way. I just read the APA Peer Review report, dated Oct 15, 2014. That report solidified my impressions and uneasiness with the project as currently drafted. Here are excerpts from that well written and concise report:

The current CDOT plan "Lacks a systemic, longterm perspective."

"There appears to be little accomplished in the I-70 corridor planning process to develop and support a carefully thought-out multimodal strategy."

"The preferred alternative cross section is wider than a football field is long. It would maximize rather than minimize impact on the abutting Environmental Justice neighborhoods."

"Was highway induced development accounted for by CDOT and Atkins? The answer is no."

"Common sense suggests that there will be a serious bottleneck for westbound traffic created by having the 10-lane section of I-70 transition down to 6 lanes to the west of the project."

"As the project sponsor, CDOT is understandably pushing hard to move a project forward."

If we are to spend over a billion dollars on this massive project, it certainly should be tied to a regional transportation plan and include socio-cultural effects. Perhaps CDOT and others are pushing too hard to make this happen come hell or high water, ignoring or downplaying critical aspects that deserve attention. At this time it would be unwise to proceed with the 10-lane expansion. I am convinced that moving forward with that plan now would likely result in downstream negative results and substantial community backlash.

Please find attached a .pdf of my comment letter on the I-70 East SDEIS. Thanks to all involved for their hard work on this project.

Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative, Other comments: How the Preferred Partial Cover Lowered Option Alternate Will Be Constructed. The DEIS does not appear to include any discussion of how the construction will be accomplished. It would appear that to demolish the existing elevated portion and to excavate and construct the lowered portion, the entire highway in the PCLO section would have to be closed during all or part of the construction. Precisely where, how and at what cost will existing traffic neighborhood and freeway be re-routed? What changes or improvements will be made to I-270 and I-76 to accommodate blocked traffic during construction? I do not believe it is satisfactory to say that these are construction issues details will be worked out by the successful contractor. All I-70 and neighborhood will be severely affected for over 5 years. Discussion of this element clearly affects the project environment significantly - and should be discussed in the EIS.

I am a Denver born, Colorado native. My primary concerns for the communities in Denver and the surrounding areas are for safety, housing, health, and education. I am gravely concerned about the widening of I-70 because of the several negative impacts it will have on the surrounding communities. I am even more concerned that these issues of impact have not been addressed. What will happen to displaced families who will lose their homes? How will the health of the people of these areas be addressed? I have listed other concerns below. Thank you for your time. To: Mr. Don Hunt, Colorado Department of Transportation From: Jill Fleishman, Kari Collins, Patrick Prag | Iliff School of Theology | 2201 South University Boulevard, Denver, CO 80210 Subject: Social and Environmental Justice Comments on I-70 for the SDEIS

Comment 1: We wish to express our serious concerns about the Colorado Department of Transportation's proposal to widen Interstate 70 in north Denver because of the devastation it will create in the mostly impoverished and Hispanic neighborhoods of Elyria-Swansea and Globeville between Colorado Boulevard and I-25. Comment 2: Widening Interstate 70 in this corridor will significantly increase the public health threat that the highway's presence already poses to residents in these neighborhoods. The City of Denver's Health Impact Assessment showed that currently, residents living within 500 feet of the present highway experience significant pollution exposure, creating asthma levels over 40%, compared to 28% citywide. Comment 3: Two elementary schools (Swansea and Garden Place) are within this 500-foot distance from I-70. Widening the highway will exacerbate these health concerns for children attending these schools. Comment 4: These neighborhoods, like others along the I-70 corridor, are burdened with air contaminants and greenhouse gas emissions, causing high incidence of respiratory illness and other chronic disease that result in early death. Widening I-70 will result in expanding the zone of serious air quality and health impacts further into these neighborhoods. Comment 5: We believe this proposal will seriously fracture the cohesiveness of these neighborhoods. Elyria-Swansea and Globeville have yet to recover from the damage of when I-70 was first constructed fifty years ago. Numerous homes and local businesses were removed, and this access-limiting highway separated close-knit families and neighborhoods. The communities became detached from the rest of city and had to live with the negative effects of an elevated viaduct, including dirt, air pollution, noise, and shadows. This proposal of widening I-70 to more than 300 feet in width will remove the families living on 7 of 14 core blocks in Elyria displacing at least fifty families and will create further barriers between families and neighbors living north and south of the proposed expanded highway. Comment 6: Currently, there is no proposal for helping replace the housing stock that this project will remove with comparably priced housing in the same area. Displaced homeowners will not be equipped to find similar housing, and certainly not near the same neighborhood. This is a serious disruption of an already damaged social environment. Comment 7: Engineering that does not start with an understanding of neighborhoods and people is bad engineering. Engineering that does not advance community values and which results in displacement is social engineering at its worst. Comment 8: We oppose this proposal not only because it is unjust but also because it is immoral for what it does to the disenfranchised of our city. These neighborhoods will receive no significant social or environmental benefits with the approval of this proposal. Comment 9: This project does not improve connectivity, improve health and wellness of residents, make the community more livable nor provide benefits for improved mobility, especially given the high proportion of residents who do not own or operate motor vehicles. Comment 10: We request that the Colorado Department of Transportation develop a solution that listens to the needs and wants of those who live in these neighborhoods. We seek an outcome that does not displace homes, families, or businesses in these neighborhoods. Comment 11: We seek a solution that demonstrably improves the health and wellness of residents beyond conditions that exist today that is, a solution that results in measurably better health conditions for residents, school children, workers and visitors to these neighborhoods. Comment 12: We request a solution that improves mobility and accessibility of residents of these neighborhoods, that does not continue to rely on fossil fuel technology, and provides instead new investments in transit, sidewalk completion, separation of railways, and bicycle connections. Comment 13: We request a solution that focuses foremost on improved connectivity within these neighborhoods and repairing the damage caused by locating I-70 here more than 50 years ago. Comment 14: We strongly affirm that investing in making these communities more complete, more vibrant, and healthier should be the city and state's priority, not damaging them further through this misguided proposal.

My other is loving your neighbor. I was sent to Horace Mann in 1976, why do we continue to ignore the opportunity to love our neighbors in that area? We believe this proposal will seriously fracture the cohesiveness of these neighborhoods. Elyria-Swansea and Globeville have yet to recover from the damage of when I-70 was first constructed fifty years ago. Numerous homes and local businesses were removed, and this access-limiting highway separated close-knit families and neighborhoods. The communities became detached from the rest of city and had to live with the negative effects of an elevated viaduct, including dirt, air pollution, noise, and shadows. This proposal of widening I-70 to more than 300 feet in width will remove the families living on 7 of 14 core blocks in Elyria displacing at least fifty families and will create further barriers between families and neighbors living north and south of the proposed expanded highway.

The proposed work on I70 between Colorado Blvd and I25 seems to be a rash decision. The project will negatively impact not only the local school (much too close) but property values in the surrounding neighborhoods. Construction in this area of high environmental concerns is also a very risky undertaking. Please look at alternatives such as a re-route of I70 that are much less damaging to State budgets and state citizens. Thank you

It is disturbing that the preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative does not include significant vegetative buffers, enhanced connectivity for pedestrians across the interstate corridor, or multi-modal considerations all of which would improve livability. A project of this magnitude, with such long-lasting effects should provide more benefits; it needs more balanced planning. The roadway engineering itself is questionable since it is planned that the interstate would CLOSE in a major rain or flood event. We can and should do better.

I do not think the current 'preferred' plan should be chosen for several reasons. I think that through-traffic should be re-routed around downtown Denver by expanding the I-270/76 route. I believe that CDOT has inflated the cost projections for that alternative and low-balled the 'sunken gardens' alternative cost. If much of the I-70 traffic is indeed commuters going to jobs downtown, many of those people will use the train once it becomes available, if RTD provides adequate parking and access. The current trend is for fewer people to own cars; more young people want alternatives and would rather bike or take the train. I am also concerned about giving control of toll lanes to a private business because of the restrictions they would be able to place on other transportation in order to preserve their profitability. I think a monstrous 10-lane I-70 with toll lanes will end up being a huge mistake and waste of money that would be put to much better use on other transportation needs.

Widening Interstate 70 in this corridor will significantly increase the public health threat that the highway's presence already poses to residents in these neighborhoods. The City of Denver's Health Impact Assessment showed that currently, residents living within 500 feet of the present highway experience significant pollution exposure, creating asthma levels over 40%, compared to 28% citywide.



APA Overview Clearly Identifies Significant Flaws / Shortfalls in the planning and design process to date. American Planning Association Transportation Planning Division I-70 East Reconstruction Denver, Colorado Transportation Planning Division Peer Review & White Paper October 15, 2014 This peer review analysis identifies significant flaws in each of the 8 reviewed areas of concern -which draw into question the entire DEIS process. #1 - Transportation System Planning #2 - Travel Demand Modeling #3 - Managed Lanes #4 - Community and Economic Development #5 - Constructability & Construction Impacts #6 - Vasquez Interchange Design Consideration #7 - Mobility During Construction #8 - Community Engagement Process The entire document is available for review at: [www.planning.org/divisions/transportation/report/pdf/DenverI70peerreview.pdf](http://www.planning.org/divisions/transportation/report/pdf/DenverI70peerreview.pdf) It would appear that each of these areas of concern should be addressed and resolved before the process moves forward.

Yes, we need to replace the obsolete, decaying infrastructure and add spare capacity for the future. But the currently proposed project is far too expensive, requiring too much private financial involvement.

As a transportation professional working in the Denver region, I think the number of lanes of traffic, normal lanes and managed lanes is too much. There are many studies that show, if you build more road capacity, more lanes, those lanes will become congested. An example of if you build it they will come. Almost three times the width of the current roadway is too much, too big. In addition to the build and they will come issue, there is data that people, especially younger folks who we are building this for, are not driving as much as before. The traditional traffic models cannot be relied on to paint an accurate picture of the traffic needs of the future. The region and RTD have spent years and money building a light rail that follows much of the I-70 corridor. We should all be encouraging residents and visitors to make use of this transportation option. These neighborhoods are already cut off from other parts of the city because of the current I-70, I-25 and the river. Increasing the size of I-70 will only serve to exacerbate this issue. Create an even less bike and pedestrian friendly area. The nearly completed Globeville Neighborhood Plan says that pedestrian and bicycle movements should be prioritized. The construction process alone will be a hazard to pedestrians and people on bikes for many years to come, hindering the progress and improvements that have been taking place in the neighborhoods in the past few years. Pollution in the surrounding neighborhoods, Globeville, Elyria and Swansea, is already extremely high and will only increase with 10 lanes of traffic, plus the years of construction that will lead up to it. I am asking CDOT to do a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement that includes both I-270 and I-76. Before creating a huge impact in deep-rooted delicate neighborhoods and spending a HUGE amount of tax payer money, the public needs to be informed that it is truly the best option. I am not convinced this is what is best for the Denver region.

Why is this FAR better option not being explored and implemented? Re-routing I-70 onto a widened and improved I-270 and I-76 appears that it would effectively address I-70's traffic congestion on both sides of I-25 for half the money of the current preferred alternative and impact zero neighborhoods. The non-local traffic would drive 1.8 miles farther, but get to their destinations faster & use less fuel, avoiding the bottleneck CDOT is about to create. The current six lanes of I-70 would remain six lanes, but as a boulevard which is expected to handle traffic better, especially during rush hour. In total, there would be much greater capacity and 12 I-70 adjacent neighborhoods would be cleaner & safer while creating wonderful economic development opportunities for large sections of undeveloped Adams County. A Much Better Plan for I-70!! The Re-Routing I-70 plan weaves the urban fabric of 12 neighborhoods back together. It moves non-local traffic & its pollution to where there are no neighborhoods. Please consider this alternate plan!

I am opposed to all the alternatives presented in the I-70 East DSEIS. I believe that none of the alternatives has widespread support, and that CDOT should withdraw the DSEIS and start over with a more regional and comprehensive approach to the I-70 problem. CDOT has resolutely refused to consider I-70 East as part of a bigger picture, defining the project and the project area in such a way as to conceal or render irrelevant various consequential matters, apparently in service of a pre-determined outcome. This has resulted in a faulty and incomplete process, and has contributed to many deficiencies in the DSEIS. It is self-evident that construction of the PCL alternative (ten lanes) will make a future expansion of I-70 West of the Mousetrap more likely. The inclusion of managed lanes in I-70 East will create new pressure for similarly assured travel speeds (for toll-payers) west of the Mousetrap. Impacts to environmental justice, air quality, social disruption, etc. will be attendant on the widening of I-70 West. These and other impacts will be part of the cumulative effects of I-70 across the north side of Denver, because if PCL is built, then widening I-70 West is a reasonably foreseeable future project. For the present DSEIS not to include these impacts is disingenuous and manipulative, with the evident aim of side-stepping concerns from NW Denver instead of evaluating them. Even within its own terms the DSEIS is deficient in a number of ways. Here are some of them: 1. No analysis of PM2.5. Highways are a major source of small particulate matter. The smallest particles have the most serious health impacts. The DSEIS should have measured, modeled, and analyzed the proposed PCL alternative's effect on PM2.5 concentrations. 2. The project area already suffers from degraded air quality, in significant part due to the presence of I-70. Not even CDOT would try to assert that under the NEPA rules I-70 could be located across North Denver now. For the DSEIS not to evaluate any alternative that would actually mitigate/reverse the impacts of the existing location of I-70 East is a major deficiency. CDOT should formally study the re-routing of I-70 via I-270 and I-76. 3. The proximity of Swansea Elementary School to I-70 violates the present requirement for a minimum .5 mile separation between Interstate highways and schools. For the DSEIS not to have evaluated moving Swansea ES to a safe distance, either for the duration of construction or permanently, is a glaring deficiency. 4. Heavy trucks produce a large proportion of the air polluting effects connected with I-70. The DSEIS is deficient in having no study of re-routing and/or otherwise managing truck traffic to reduce impacts on AQ. Lastly, I regard any highway expansion through poor, minority and disadvantaged communities as ethically insupportable. CDOT must consider a wider range of alternatives.

I am a community member, mother, resident of my beloved Sunnyside neighborhood, and Realtor. I am writing to say that I oppose the current proposal to widen I70. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to do something right for our city, and this proposal is not it! This proposal has so much wrong with it, it's difficult to know where to start. I'm sure you've gotten plenty of comments, and since there's only so many ways to say the same thing, I will be brief. Health impacts on the communities of Globeville/Elyria/Swansea, destruction of homes and businesses, financial consequences (the current plan consumes huge portions of the State's bridge budget for many decades), not to mention the high likelihood of a bottle neck west of I25. So then what, more widening, destroying more homes and businesses, where does it end!?!? The Pollution in the neighborhoods of Globeville/Elyria/Swansea is already incredibly high. Life expectancy is much shorter for these residents than other nearby Denver communities. It is unacceptable to bring the highway even closer to their elementary school. Especially when there is a much better way! Please CDOT, do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76!

<p>I think the best solution is to re-route I-70 so that the currently separated and disrupted communities can be renewed. Health concerns related to increased pollution from increased traffic is a moral and humanitarian concern. The demolition of so many homes in the area is unconscionable. This plan needs to be dropped and another developed, perhaps using part of the I-76 corridor.</p>
<p>Please consider the alternate plan to link the expansion with 270/I-76 and save money and neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Things to alleviate traffic on the I70 corridor between Glenwood Springs and Golden: Only local Truck use during winter months. Trucks not allowed in left lane. No trucks or non 4WD on snowy days on the passes. Open medians and shoulders and local roads for traffic flow Have state troopers and local police used to enforce and help guide traffic. No construction on roads during winter months. Only use LED road signs in emergency, they slow traffic.</p>
<p>The current plan seems terribly inefficient, harmful (fiscally &amp; environmentally) and overall a solution that only has more negative impacts on the community and people that live there.</p>
<p>The expansion of I-70 needs to take into account whether the money for the project is worth the trouble. Putting people out of homes, small, family owned businesses out of business and affecting young children. I urge our leaders to look at ALL options for the people of Denver and choose what is best for them, not the pockets of a company so their CEO can go buy his 3rd vacation home. It is time the average Joe is put first!</p>
<p>Without repeating all of the valid points raised in the October 15, 2014, American Planning Association (APA) White Paper, I will comment that I share ALL of these reasonable and significant concerns regarding the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) I-70 reconstruction proposal. Despite CDOT assurances that homeowners in the affected areas will be treated fairly, I continue to have serious concerns that economic justice will not prevail and less than adequate provisions will be made for the scores of homeowners who will be displaced. CDOT's refusal to consider the I-76/270 re-routing alternative is very troubling and suggesting that this will "cost at least twice as much" without completing a full study is irresponsible and disingenuous. I am very concerned as a tax payor and as a person living just south of the I-70 project area that CDOT has not done the expected due diligence needed to assure this project is considering the next 25-50 years of impact on the neighborhoods, the city of Denver, Adams and Denver counties and the region.</p>
<p>It is my belief CDOT has short-circuited the process, and short-changed Colorado by eliminating the 270-76 re-route alternative. The claim no improvements will be needed west of I-25 is hard to believe. If there are five westbound lanes planned as part of this process, and its expected to merge into three at I-25, I expect we'll be hearing from CDOT in a few years. When rejecting the 270-76 re-route, did it include the costs to deal with the bottleneck this project would create? It doesn't appear so. I believe there will be a great economic drag created from this expensive, ill-conceived project. When I-70 west of I-25 needs to be rebuilt, we will extend the years of construction impact on local traffic and tourist traffic to the mountains. Further, I can't imagine the unknowns from dropping a highway underground into a water table, and I fear those will burden our taxpayers. Please do not double down on the first 50 year mistake. The 270-76 route and boulevard idea is the better option for the short and long term prosperity of our neighborhoods and our economy. Taking highways out to the industrial edge, and rebuilding the city neighborhoods would be a legacy our leaders can be truly proud of.</p>
<p>The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement process was deficient because it does not sufficiently address the impacts of widen the highway on the surrounding community, in terms of health concerns, to include noise and pollution. It also fails to establish a valid need for the project, as current traffic data and future trends would suggestion such an expansion is unnecessary. The SEIS also failed to properly study alternate routes, such as the 270/76 reroute option and perhaps other ideas, again using current data and cost projections. The lack of CDOT's presence at town meetings is deplorable, as is the lack of transparency about cost and purpose. The addition of toll lanes is the ultimate form of insidious discrimination against those struggling with poverty. This is, simply, a bad idea for people. We need to be planning for the people first, and find a way to move traffic that is not so devastation to a huge part of our city. The truckers will survive, Purina and the Stock Complex will survive, but will the people of North Denver, Swansea Elementary School and a host of small businesses and homes? Again, the project is just a bad idea.</p>
<p>To Project Team and Task Force For the record - I am opposed to the widening of the I-70 corridor for previous reasons stated, relating to: - Negative Impact on adjacent property values - Negative impact on the historic nature of the adjacent neighborhoods - There are alternatives identified preferred by many, creating an improved by-pass that utilizes the existing I-270 &amp; I-76 Corridors. - Ignoring the opportunity to mend the currently severed neighborhood by the existing I-70 route, by relocating to the north through an already established commercial / industrial zone. - An therefore creating an improved visual of/for our city as these older neighborhoods can be redeveloped and restored.</p>

I do not understand all the consolations to Swansea Elementary school, the children who attend it, and the neighborhoods that surround it. So-called community leaders continue to refer to the area as a viable community, but those opinions are only romanticizing neighborhoods that are surrounded by brownfields. This is just another example of politicking for the minority so the politician can brand themselves as caring. The area is depressed and will remain so regardless of what happens to I-70. It has been said that DPS will not move Swansea Elementary, but considering the price tag and impact of the expansion of I-70, it seems that DPS is just being obstinate. The cost of a new school, when DPS claims they may have to expand the current school anyway, should not be a consideration if the concern is truly about impacts of air quality on kids. Indeed, when considering the highway project will likely exceed \$2 billion, moving a school is peanuts. If DPS is holding out, then force the project to set aside \$2 million to build a new state-of-the-art school. That is, after all, 1000 times less than the highway project. I find it absurd that 600 kids should affect a project that will affect millions over time. I think the school, the kids, and the arguments about community are just a red herring. Honestly, someone should explain how those neighborhoods will be revitalized by burying the road or worse, moving it miles away (the I-270/I-76 ludicrous option). I agree that the viaduct was a bad idea, but it was born in a time when it was fashionable to build viaducts. Obviously, the intention is to not replace the viaduct, but the idea that an entire metropolitan area and travelers from around the country should be stymied by one elementary school and 600 kids (who will be replaced by another 600 kids during construction, and so on) is pure idiocy. It is the product of Environmental Justice, another awful idea that panders to an agenda. The neighborhoods most affected by the project are depressed, poor, and blighted. Whatever the reason they became that way is not the point. Many neighborhoods in many cities evolve -- some go from good to bad and then back to good through gentrification. But these neighborhoods are not likely to experience any gentrification simply because they are surrounded by brownfield development. To argue that we should move the road or bury it at great expense because of a depressed, blighted neighborhood is shortsighted. After all, if the best laid plans don't pan out, do we next force industry to move? If so, where? Another neighborhood? And why should another neighborhood suffer brownfields? Government excels at wasting taxpayer money, and this is no exception. It is an old highway that needs to be replaced, but politics is turning it into a way to waste extravagantly. Take the school out of the equation, and it will make replacing the road easier. I'd be very curious then to see what new arguments against the project would be invented.

The I-70 East SDEIS is flawed. My comment concerns the refusal of CDOT to complete a SEIS on other alternatives that meet the purpose and need of the project, i.e., to improve the I-70 corridor in the northeastern portion of Denver, CO. The project area, as defined by CDOT, includes the eastern part of I-270, but not the western part as it approaches I-25 nor I-76 from the intersection of I-25 and I-270 to Wadsworth Blvd. (Exhibit 2A, page 2-3, August, 2014). The project area should be expanded to include a reasonable alternative that meets the purpose and need of the project which is not in the project area. That alternative is the rerouting of I-70 from Central Parkway on the east via I-270 and continuing along I-76 westerly to Wadsworth Blvd, i.e., the "reroute" alternative. The August 2014 SDEIS eliminated this alternative (page 3-18, August 2014) although most of the discussion concerned only I-270. From an historical perspective, the 2008 EIS considered this "reroute" and eliminated it from further analysis (Page 3-18, November, 2008). Similarly, it also eliminated the below grade option between Brighton Blvd and Colorado Blvd (page, 3-51, November, 2008). In the present SDEIS (August, 2014) a "new alternative (the Partial Covered Lowered Alternative" was introduced (Section ES.4, page ES-5, August, 2014). I infer from this paragraph that the "reroute" along with other alternative was eliminated from further analysis. I am still under the impression the "reroute" was really not considered--only the eastern part of I-270 was considered. Subsequently, I (and others) asked CDOT why the "reroute was not reconsidered along with the partial covered alternative. The primary reason given was cost. I have included a two-page document from CDOT (dated July 9, 2012) entitled "I-270/I-76 Reroute/Bypass Alternative" which concludes that the cost would be in the vicinity of \$8.9M per mile. With other costs, the total project cost would be in the vicinity of \$3.35B. I cannot accept this analysis--building/rebuilding I-270/I-76 with at-grade construction on land almost entirely owned by the State. Other Departments of transportation, e.g., Florida and Washington, spent less with at-grade highway construction. The entire I-70 East project, from Brighton Blvd to Tower Road, will cost an estimated \$1.8B- \$2.0B. Of that, the lowered alternative portion will cost approximately \$1B. (Assuming the length of this portion is 8,000 ft and will contain 10 lanes, the \$1B/15.2 Miles is considerably greater than the cost of the "reroute"--using CDOT's numbers). I think a SEIS that includes the "reroute" could be accomplished within one year and cost about \$1M would demonstrate the feasibility (or non-feasibility) of constructing the "reroute" and for considerably less than the estimated cost of the Partial Covered Lowered Alternative. If the recommended SEIS was begun several years ago, it would be completed by now. That proposed SEIS and the current SDEIS would have provided the best information for CDOT to proceed. In my opinion CDOT has wasted much time, much money and its reputation trying to convince a skeptical community that it has its best interests at heart. (Parenthetically, this project--Partial Covered Lowered Alternative--is not simply a neighborhood project affecting only Globeville, Swansea and Elyria (GES) although selected members of the Denver administration and Denver City Council would like us to believe. The word "community" includes neighborhood east and west of GES. It includes Denver residents (and Denver taxpayers) as well as Colorado residents (and taxpayers). For these reasons, I have concluded that the SDEIS is flawed. CDOT should include a SEIS evaluating the "reroute" as it prepares the Final EIS in which it will identify the Preferred Alternative.

I believe my conclusions are supported, in effect, by two other documents directly related to this same issue of I-70; one is another comment on file in this matter which I have endorsed, titled The Supplemental Draft EIS For Proposed Expansion of I-70 East Must Be Revised To Adequately Disclose Impacts of Emissions On Community Health And Air Quality, by Robert E. Yuhnke; the other, so far as I know, is not entered as a comment to CDOT but is directed to this same issue and is published by the American Planning Association Transportation Planning Division, I-70 East Reconstruction Denver, Colorado, Peer Review and White Paper, October 15, 2014, which I can send to you at your request. I incorporate both of these documents by reference herein. As background information, I am a retired lawyer, Pueblo native, A.B. Harvard College, LL.B. Stanford Law School, Pueblo Deputy District Attorney, Colorado State Representative (JBC 4 years), State Senator, Chief Deputy State Public Defender, Attorney General and Denver Manager of Safety. Currently I am a Denver County Colorado Master Gardener and volunteer CMG at the Jeffco Plant Clinic at the CSU Jefferson County Extension Office at the Jeffco Fairgrounds in Golden. I live in the northeast quadrant of Denver, Park Hill, approximately 3 miles from the intersection of Colorado Blvd. and I-70. During growing season I go to and from Jefferson County on I-70 as often as once a week or more, usually during the morning and evening rush hours. Although I-70 is faster, the 6th Avenue (U.S. 6) freeway is shorter but the rush hour traffic to and from 6th Avenue and Santa Fe/Kalamath to and from my residence generally takes longer than the I-70 route. I have attended a number of meetings and obtained additional information from CDOT and Unite North Metro Denver concerning the proposed reconstruction of I-70 through east Denver and CDOT's preferred alternative involving Globeville, Elyria and Swansea (GES). Being bisected by I-70 for 50 years, these neighborhoods have had to put up with the lack of connectivity, noise and air pollution emissions from passing traffic. I have often wondered why the I-70 route was not originally aligned to join I-76 as part of I-70 avoiding the disruption of Denver neighborhoods. Multiple problems are caused by CDOT's insistence on reconstructing the eastern part of I-70 instead of realigning it with I-270 and I-76. CDOT claims that alternative would at least double the cost of its preferred alternative. CDOT refuses to detail how they arrived at that conclusion. The CDOT claim is not credible for that and for the following reasons: 1. Financing: As stated above, CDOT claims that its preferred alternative would cost less than moving I-70 to the I-270/I-76 alignment. Unite North Metro Denver thinks the cost would be considerably less than CDOT's preferred alternative. Unless CDOT provides the itemized details of its assertion that it will cost more than its preferred alternative that claim cannot be accepted. CDOT already owns the right of way on the I-270/I-76 alignment and there is room for an additional 2 lanes (currently 4 lanes); 2. Environmental justice: Moving I-70 north enables reconnecting the neighborhoods that were severed by the I-70 corridor and frees them from the negative impacts of I-70; 3. Truck traffic: Moving I-70 north removes the noise and pollution caused by vehicular emissions, particularly from truck traffic, along the current I-70 corridor; 4. Swansea Elementary: Moving I-70 north removes all the problems that the school now has with its proximity to I-70; 5. Property impacts: Moving I-70 north would enable a new boulevard on 46th Avenue east of I-25 and on 48th Avenue west of I-25. Property values adjacent to the I-70 corridor would increase due to greater accessibility to the reunited neighborhoods. 6. Hazardous materials: Moving I-70 north avoids the problems raised by the CDOT preferred alternative with removal of contaminated soil in the deep trench proposed and avoids toxic emissions from truck and construction equipment involved in the trench excavation and removal and disposal of contaminated soils; 7. Historic: Denver neighborhoods divided by I-70 were historic neighborhoods. Restoring their cohesiveness by moving I-70 to the I-270/I-76 alignment will be a huge benefit to the residents with the elimination of that massive barrier after the five decades of being split apart and will restore their historic status; 8. Noise: Moving I-70 north avoids the noise that would be created by CDOT's preferred alternative of trenching and covering I-70 past Swansea Elementary School and the noise that vehicles create on the I-70 corridor; 9. Preliminary Identified preferred alternative: Moving I-70 to the I-270/I-76 alignment would eliminate this alternative together with its cost and disruption during construction; 10. Air Quality: Moving I-70 north will immediately improve the air quality on both sides of the existing I-70 corridor. The sources of pollution and emissions will be moving along a route that is removed from the existing corridor and is not in proximity to adjacent neighborhoods. 11. Visual: In addition to the removal of the I-70 corridor from its current location, the vacated land can be made available for tree-lined boulevards with greenery and a renewal of the area vacated with good architectural designs is possible. What is now a desolate stretch of concrete, asphalt and steel can become an enticing entry into Denver from Denver International Airport. 12. Other: The list is virtually endless with possible improvements to the vacated I-70 corridor through Denver. The project could become a rebirth of the Denver Dream created by Mayor Speer, with a magnificent boulevard showing off Denver and its spectacular mountains on the way in from DIA and the west Denver neighborhoods. Finally, the only practical option for rerouting I-70 traffic during construction of the extra lanes, trench and cover is to divert all traffic north to the I-270/I-76 route. It is clear that would require adding two lanes to I-270 and possibly to I-76 since existing traffic on I-270 is jammed during both morning and evening rush hours now. The obvious question is, why not choose the I-270/I-76 alignment as the permanent route for E-70 now?

Inducing Demand for Cars is Wrong The citizens of Denver have voted to shift funding from roads to transit. As a part of that project, we are building two rail lines that may give real options to residents of the Denver area. The rail lines that connect Denver to the airport and to Thornton need to be supported. Widening I-70 does not do this. Widening a highway encourages people to drive. It encourages local governments to spend money on roads rather than other needs. The number one determinant of transportation mode is subsidy. How we spend our tax money strongly influences whether people drive or take the bus. We should be using our economic resources to build good sidewalks to the new train lines. We should be using our economic resources to create frequent bus connections to the new train lines. We should be using our economic resources to create bus and train connections to the FasTracks rail lines so that people can use to transit to get to the rest of the state. We should be using our economic resources to keep our freight rail system from falling behind the rest of the country. No widening of I-70.

Seek an alternative to the current destructive I-70 plan. Use the alternate route, please. Do not be lazy.

To Whom It May Concern:

I have two comments:

- 1) I would like to see Purina Chow relocated outside of the neighborhoods.
- 2) I would like to see I-70 rerouted away from the neighborhoods.

The original dividing of the neighborhoods by I70 and I25 has created tremendous negative social and environmental impacts on those communities. It is disappointing that the CDOT Preferred Alternative seeks to expand the roadway, destroying further homes and in return, radically increasing the number of vehicles pouring pollution down on these same neighborhoods. It seems that the most just thing to do would be to choose an alternative that begins to right these historic wrongs (perhaps one of the realignment alternatives). At a minimum, the No-Action Alternative should be chosen at least it won't make things any more unhealthy than they already are. Thank you.

I have been to several meetings and just wanted to reiterate that I think the partial covered idea with the park on top is by far and away the best solution for this area. I own a home in Swansea and I think this will help spark Swanses recovery. New businesses and people taking better care of their homes. thank you,

As highlighted and discussed in the I-70 East Reconstruction – Denver, Colorado Transportation Planning Division Peer Review & White Paper from the American Planning Association dated October 14, 2014, the lack of comprehensive system wide planning and near absolute avoidance of community planning seems to be a major oversight of CDOT and the other communities and agencies that support the current preferred alternative. In my professional opinion, if this “trench” is constructed we will be stuck with it, and the disconnects, environmental impacts and community isolation it creates for the next several generations or longer. I understand that CDOT is the lead agency, and their mission as defined on their website is To provide the best multi-modal transportation system for Colorado that most effectively and safely moves people, goods, and information. But as stated in the White Paper noted above and from my observations and involvement in the project planning process, it appears the purpose and need of the I-70 East project is short sighted and narrow in focus. By this I mean it considers the importance of the I-70 infrastructure but only as a means of moving traffic and not on it’s role or impacts on and in the neighborhoods and communities it bisects and bypasses. In an effort to ensure that the current preferred alternative is the best solution for a larger majority of interested parties, would CDOT be willing to delay the release of the Final EIS until the City has approved and adopted various planning documents for communities, corridors and facilities within the I-70 East project area? These planning efforts include, but aren’t limited to, the Globeville Neighborhood Plan, Elyria Swansea Neighborhood Plan, National Western Stock Show Station Area Plan, National Western Center, Brighton Blvd Corridor Redevelopment, River North (RiNo) and various RTD Station Development plans. By delaying the release of the Final EIS, CDOT and other regulating agencies such as the City and County of Denver and DRCOG could ensure that the selected preferred alternative is a solution that sets the foundation for a strong future by defining land use, economic strategies, and development solutions that compliment and support the interstate freeway, regional and community infrastructures equally.

I am not in favor of routing traffic off of I-70 to I-76 and I-270. Seems a bit ridiculous to take a current highway that runs east and west and route it to the north, only to bring it back south. All the highways are already full enough so I seriously doubt you can add the volume from I-70 to the alternate re-route option. Furthermore, I for one like being near and having quick access to the highway. It makes it very easy for me to get to DIA, I-25 or heading west to the mountains. I have heard that I-70 will expand if we don't have a reroute option but that seems unlikely because the traffic isn't too bad today because so many vehicles on I-70 going west exit at I-25. Another argument I have heard for a reroute is so it can revitalize the north Denver neighborhoods. Hello! Has anyone taken a drive through Berkeley, Sunny Side or the Rhino district lately. Looks like they are already being revitalized so that argument is hollow.

This cannot be the best alternative available to ease I-70s traffic problems. The digging necessary to create the trench will inevitably release contaminated soil into the air to be breathed in by local residents already dealing with air pollution. The wall of the trench will stop the natural flow of groundwater too; how can you say it will not raise the water table on the south side of the trench, causing problems for residents there? It seems with cost of containment and remediation of contaminated soil and the engineering challenges of rerouting utilities and managing groundwater, this really can't be the best way to go. How can you say putting a cover over the interstate for two and a half blocks will reconnect the community, when there will be far fewer ways to get from one side of I-70 to the other? Walkers and bikers will have the hardest time getting around. The community will be divided even further. And you are doing this project at a time when smart city planners recognize that people are driving less and using other forms of transportation more. How can you say that widening of the highway on the east side of I-70 will not lead to the need for widening on the west side? There are many more homes on the west side of I-25, and that surely will not fly. Increasing I-70 to 10 lanes here will only bring in more traffic and the highway will fill. It would be wiser to disperse the traffic, by rerouting I-70 and creating a boulevard in it's current location through the city. Many cities across the world have removed major highways from their urban areas, and the result has not ever been negative. The city gets better. Take this opportunity to make Denver better. Why has CDOT not taken a serious look at the full reroute along I-270 and I-76? Why are the cost numbers CDOT has calculated for the I-270/I-76 reroute grossly inflated and incorrect? Please do an SEIS on the full reroute along I-270 and I-76. The people of Denver and Colorado deserve a better alternative than the one CDOT is advocating.

Closing I-70 and York impacts the neighborhood adding congestion to on and off ramps at Colorado Blvd and Brighton. University/York moves traffic from South Denver to North Denver without having to get on a highway but closing York prevents connectivity.

The new high way will eliminate housing. Noise and construction for five years. Removing exits for accessibility to the neighborhood. Lack of knowledge about the impact of a tunnel - ice, flooding, etc. Will not put community back together. No homes in Elyria that will connect; it's mainly industry. Environmental concerns about the dirt given the history of smelters. A blvd vs. a highway will keep the neighborhood together. If no decision has been made why are homes being purchased, boarded and have signage indicating that it is CDOT property. Has the decision already been made? What are the plan when the highway crosses over I-25 and the lanes are reduced due to space constraints. The inability to extend lanes west of I-25. What is the impact to the new Pecos bridge? The Swansea neighborhood is not in favor of this, contrary to what is being communicated. As a resident of Swansea for over 50 years, I am not in favor. The highway should be torn down and traffic should be rerouted to 76 and 270. There is more land and more space to build and expand.

This an idea with total disregard for a unique neighborhood. It also releases the contaminants into the air from a super fund clean up site. This is one of the most affordable neighborhoods in Denver and contributes to the diversity of home ownership and allows home purchase to a demographic that is being overlooked and disregarded as Denver races to change. In doing this Denver will destroy what it represents; a home for the people who represent all walks of life and economic possibility. I hope this plan will be replaced by one that does not destroy a neighborhood in favor of traffic and hoped for efficient traffic flow.

I would like to voice support for a plan to reroute I-70 to the north utilizing 270 and bringing the neighborhoods currently split by the highway back together. The route along 270 is mostly industrial and there would be less impact on residential areas. I hope this solution will be carefully considered.

There is no evidence in the EIS that a study has been done or is required of the soil that will be removed from the 40 ft. depth of this highway construction. This is an injustice to the residents and the businesses that will need to live with these possible health hazards for at least the five years of construction. The EIS needs to prove that there are no health related concerns during and after construction.

This is my comments in relation to the proposed new I-70 project. The more I read about this topic the less I agree with it. The impact on the neighborhood of eliminating homes and businesses is a disruption to the people there. It is not healthy or helpful to them. Also, I do not agree that this will not increase the pollution factor in that area. Not only will the neighborhood be subject to more and more traffic and pollution, the schools will also suffer. Our city already has a problem with pollution and to add more traffic, especially heavy traffic that will include more trucks, etc., is a real negative factor in the overall health of the neighborhood, our city, especially the central area, and to the metro area in general. I also do not find that the amount of the budgeted funds for bridges in general will suffer with so much being targeted to this one project. There are many bridges that need to be repaired. It is not fair to allocate so much to this one project. Finally, the neighborhood needs to be brought closer together, not separated even further. The idea that this overhead park-like area will actually bring the neighborhood together does not seem logical. What is logical is to eliminate the bridge, and provide a closer neighborhood that can live in a safe, less polluted, less heavily trafficked situation. Please reconsider your current plans, and look to other alternatives. They are out there. And look more closely at the effects on the neighborhood and the basic central area of Denver that does not need this.

I am a property owner and a concerned citizen. The proposed plan as I know it is over the top in a narrow vision. The money is excessive, the impact on the present neighborhoods is far to extreme. I would support a plan for re-routing traffic flow with an indepth look at truck traffic. The lite rail should be considered for its part in reducing traffic along this corridor. Thank you

As a taxpayer, I am appalled when I hear of the cost of this expansion and the people that will be served by this expansion. Toll lanes are for those who can afford them not for lower income people. The financing of this project will include private investment that includes an interest rate that has not been made public. Using state bridge money is not acceptable. Denver already has the reputation of taking a larger share of the state budget proportionately than other parts of the state.

Closing entrances and exits between Brighton Blvd and Colorado Blvd would be devastating to (CSEGSC neighborhoods) making us use the Colorado Blvd & I70 exit which is already a nightmare. I am not sure of the statistical information on the number of cars using it but that would I am sure double. This will have a tremendous negative environmental impact on these neighborhoods and commuters to and from work and home..

The current CDOT proposal has the following negative features: 1. This project will leave a 300 ft. canyon (the length of a football field), 28 feet deep, with 8 to 12 foot sound barrier walls dividing the neighborhoods from the rest of the city. This would only be mitigated by an 800 ft. cover over approximately 10% of the length of the below grade highway. 2. It would be extremely disruptive to the education of the students at the school during the construction project and potentially harmful to their health after completion. 3. CDOT is considering public-private funding for the project. This would turn the highway into a partial toll road between Brighton Boulevard and the airport, increasing traffic congestion for local trips. 4. The complex construction process would produce increased traffic congestion during the three to five year construction process. 5. Restriping the bridge over I-25 to create 3 lanes will create a traffic bottleneck for westbound traffic immediately west of the bridge over I-25. 6. There are unresolved issues surrounding contaminated groundwater from ASARCO that must be treated and disposed of into the Platte River during construction. 7. The project will cost approximately \$2 billion with no proven economic benefit to the city. 8. Widening the highway to 5 lanes east of I-25 and in the mountains will require future widening west of I-25. The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative for I-70 proposal has the following potential advantages: 1. It will reintegrate the Globeville, Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods into the city. 2. It would allow provision of needed retail and commercial establishments serving the communities. 3. When other cities have removed highways it has raised property values an average of between \$160,000 and \$180,000. 4. It would stimulate appropriate economic development along the I-270/I-76 corridor where almost no residential housing exists. 5. The construction of additional lanes along I-76 and I-270 prior to closing I-70 allows for less interruption of traffic during construction and a less complex construction process. According to the City of Denver this would reduce the construction time by a year or two years. 6. It provides Denver with an attractive entry from the airport for visitors to the city. 7. By providing easy access through surface level streets, it supports the development of the Stock Show Complex for year-round events and activities at the Denver Coliseum. 8. It provides land almost half the size of Stapleton along the I-70 corridor for an estimated \$1.5 billion in direct and indirect economic development. 9. It supports the development already taking place along Brighton Boulevard. 10. It enhances air quality for the communities and school children. 11. It improves traffic flow and reduces congestion on I-25. 12. It provides opportunities for public transit options along I-76, I-270 and the western part of the current I-70 corridor. 13. It removes the necessity for separately rebuilding I-270 in the future and adding lanes to I-76 to accommodate growing traffic. 14. Using data from the Washington State Department of Transportation and the Florida State Department of Transportation, it would cost between \$300 million and \$500 million less than the CDOT plan.

As a North Denver resident, I am gravely concerned about the impacts of the proposed widening of I-70 across the north side. Already, the interstate is an unwelcome scar that so destructively divides our historically connected neighborhoods including Sunnyside-Chaffee Park, Berkeley-Regis, and most significantly, Globeville-Elyria/Swansea. At its current width, the freeway brings inordinate noise, imposing, unmaintained embankments and barrier walls, air pollution, and unnecessarily complicated navigation through North Denver. Not only as a citizen but as a B.S., M.S. in Civil Engineering and Colorado licensed Professional Engineer, familiar with the construction industry, I am concerned that the proposed lowered and partially covered, 10-lane expansion will be highly destructive to the communities along the I-70 corridor, present extremely complicated and costly runoff drainage challenges, create an unjustifiable exposure of the communities to the lead and arsenic contamination in the I-70/Vasquez Blvd. superfund site. I believe it is imperative that CDOT perform a SEIS that includes potential effects of excavating large volumes of contaminated soil that exist along the I-70 corridor. The proposed \$1.9B cost is unjustified for any (debatable) benefit the Partial Covered Lowered Alternative may offer. The effects to the Swansea elementary school adjacent the freeway could be very damaging. The "solution" of placing their greenspace on top of the tunnel is not a solution. As an engineering professional, I do not concur with the traffic forecasts that yield the proposed number of lanes and alignment. I do not believe that widening the freeway will alleviate congestion because a bottleneck will still be present at the west extent of this project near the I-25 interchange. It is true that even if roadway width is not reduced when transitioned into a tunnel, that drivers will use their brake pedals and cause chain-reaction backups. I believe that a thorough examination of a potential re-route of I-70 to 270 /76 is entirely warranted and would be beneficial from a fiscal, traffic, safety and environmental standpoint. Transformation of the present I-70 to an urban boulevard and gateway to the north side of Denver is appealing because it would reintegrate divided neighborhoods, provide thoroughfare for local traffic, reduce noise, improve appearance, and substantially boost property values all along the north side. It is vitally important that these issues be addressed and can be demonstrated as preferable against the reroute option. It is unfathomable that the reroute option could not be more seriously considered, or reconsidered. Please demonstrate your assertion that: "Rerouting I-70 on I-270 and I-76 requires more than 12 miles of major highway widening, which would cost an estimated \$3.5 to \$4 billion twice the estimated cost of the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative, which is the preliminarily identified preferred alternative for the I-70 East Project." This figure seems to be grossly overestimated, in favor of the PCLA. CDOT should definitively demonstrate that "If I-70 was removed from its current location, a six-lane arterial would have to be constructed in its place to handle the area's volume of east-west traffic. A reroute of I-70 would cause significant increases in traffic on the local streets in the Elyria, Swansea, Globeville, and Park Hill neighborhood potentially exceeding 50,000 vehicles per day which compares to current traffic volume along Colorado Boulevard or Santa Fe Drive." It is entirely illogical that the same volume of highway traffic would need to be carried by the surface artery. It is insulting as a property owner to hear "There is no data to support or disprove this assertion. We do know that there are currently 684 businesses between I-25 and I-270 located along I-70 within a quarter-mile of the highway. Together, these businesses employ more than 11,000 people. Many of these businesses depend on I-70 for transportation and distribution of products, goods, and services." There have been studies to this effect, and even if there had not been, it is common sense. CDOT needs to do right by the community it serves, the citizens of Denver and north Metro communities, and do the necessary due diligence before commencing with the destructive Partial Covered Lowered Alternative.

Mind-Boggling Re-Route Estimate Disparity!! On April 25th, 2014, at Denver's Oxford Hotel, the North Metro Denver Citizens' Transportation Summit was held. Cynthia Thorstad, a vice-president with the Denver League of Women Voters -with competent engineering support, presented a shocking disparity between the CDOT estimate for the 12.4 mile I-270 / I-76 re-route and an estimate prepared by an extremely reputable engineering firm, Parsons, for a 53 mile re-construction of I-70 between C-470 and Silverthorne. CDOT's admittedly conservative estimate for the 12.4 mile 204.8 lane mile I-270 / I-76 re-route was \$4.35 Billion. Parsons estimate for the 53 mile, 550 lane mile in the mountains including several tunnels, was \$3.5 billion. Mind-boggling. Construction mostly on existing right-of-way, widening existing roadways and structures vs. nearly 2.5 times as many lane-miles in mountainous terrain. Thorstad's presentation is contained in this YouTube video. [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z6MCf\\_aemr0](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z6MCf_aemr0) In another portion of the Summit presentations, former Milwaukee mayor, and long-time head of the Congress for New Urbanism called CDOT's preferred Partially Covered Lowered Alternate breathtakingly stupid! <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cg9rcbkNKsU> How can the disparities be so huge??

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the CDOT proposal to expand I-70 in the vicinity of Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea. My comments relate to: Other (Integrity and Quality of the Project Design and Planning Process) Air Quality Environmental Justice Financing Historic Hazardous Materials Preliminary Identified Preferred Alternative Property Impacts

I have followed the CDOT Preferred Alternative by reading newspaper articles and editorials, attending a community meetings, as well as a CDOT-sponsored public meeting. My feelings all along have been that this project makes no sense. I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative for the reasons stated below. I recently had an opportunity to review the APA peer report (October 15, 2014). I am pleased to see that my concerns about the Preferred Alternative are, at least in part, supported by the work of these professionals. I trust that their concerns will be addressed by DRCOG and Denver's City Council.

INTEGRITY & QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN AND PLANNING PROCESS / PRELIMINARY IDENTIFIED PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE I concur with the APA report that the current CDOT plan "lacks a systemic, longterm perspective." Indeed, the plan would accomplish little in the I-70 corridor except create a bottleneck just west of the Globeville, Swansea, and Elyria area. I cannot doubt that CDOT would immediately seek to expand the next section of I-70, crushing additional communities in the process and spending billions more dollars in the process. Members of the community have repeatedly asked why the planning did not fully consider the northern re-route or the fact that fewer people are driving, and why the expansion of Fast Tracks (welcomed and well-used by Denver area commuters) wasn't included. Now it is clear why this was not done: CDOT and its contractor used out-of-date modeling tools, and failed to consider "highway induced development." It appears that leadership at CDOT designed the planning process to support their Preferred Alternative, rather than letting facts and public opinion guide development of a workable plan. Throughout the process, CDOT and the Denver City Council have argued that the three most-affected neighborhoods would be re-united with Denver by this enormous expansion, and have said that any problems would be mitigated. That defies logic. Every time I've heard it, my faith in the integrity of the project and City of Denver leadership has sunk further. So many of my concerns are precisely addressed in the APA report that I will not re-state them here, but I believe they have hit the mark. If we are to undertake alterations to I-70 through the City of Denver, the project should reduce the footprint and the impact of the project on neighborhoods.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE / AIR QUALITY The Proposed Alternative would further expose the residents of Globeville, Swansea, and Elyria to dangerous emissions of the sort that have already diminished their health and life expectancy significantly compared with that of the rest of the City, and of similar-income sections of the City. We should all be ashamed that some of our most powerless citizens have been exposed for so many years to air quality that has weakened their respiratory systems and caused so many of them to have chronic conditions like asthma. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires that reasonable alternatives to highway construction be considered would have prevented I-70's construction. Expansion in this area should certainly be in violation of the spirit of this Act, if not the letter of the law. Has this legality been determined? The Civil Rights Act of 1964 would have prevented this highway from dissecting these neighborhoods, had it been in existence when I-70 was built. An expansion of this side, further isolating these low-income, minority neighborhoods, if not illegal, is obviously in violation of the spirit of the law and more current sensibilities. Transportation planners have for many years acknowledged the damage done to neighborhoods and cities when the interstate system was built, and have said that it would not be built that way today. That is why beltways have been added around many cities, and that is what should be done in Denver. I support the full re-routing of I-70 to I-270 and I-76, which would avoid existing residential communities. The Environmental Justice Act of 1994, had it been in effect when I-70 was originally planned, would have prevented its ever being built. Tripling the width of the footprint must certainly be in violation of this law. CDOT and

the City of Denver have stated that widening I-70 will re-unite these neighborhoods with Denver. However, such statements are unconvincing. If past practice continues, most of the considerations will never be implemented. Since the I-70 project funding won't pay for them, they will depend on the City's budget priorities and other initiatives that will likely push them aside. Air quality in this area will undoubtedly suffer by allowing cars to travel high speeds, or sit in endless traffic jams with even fewer exits. This is an area that was mentioned in the APA report, and one that should be given extremely careful review. FINANCING It appears that CDOT has not included the cost of financing the project, but financing will most certainly be required. This naturally understates the cost of the Preferred Option, tipping the scale inappropriately in its direction. Furthermore, the proposed diversion of the equivalent of 8 years of state bridge maintenance funds to this project causes me great concern. It is common knowledge that bridge maintenance in Colorado and the United States has been dangerously neglected. Using these scarce funds for a project that may well prove unnecessary is inexcusable. HISTORIC In section 106 (Determination of Eligibility and Effects), it appears that many affected properties are considered eligible for historic designation according to the National Register, and several areas have the potential to be historic districts. It is disturbing that research on these properties is so incomplete, and the decision to demolish or adversely affect them was taken so lightly. Objections to this effect have been brushed aside, with the intention to suppress further research: see Dianna Litvak's response, admitting that the site survey forms were deficient but fearing that repair would open "a Pandora's box." With this kind of omission, the validity of the entire section of the SEIS suspect. One significant historic loss would be the Colonial Motel, which your own report states is a rare existing example of the 1940's motor lodge. There are many others, but the entire section should be re-done correctly. National Register determination should be used instead of the independent contractor that was used. PROPERTY IMPACTS The current property owners appear likely to suffer economically as a result of this project. The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policy of 1970 ensures assistance and affordable relocation for those who will be losing their properties. But since many of them are non-native speakers of English, and as low-income citizens they may not have good independent financial advice, they may well suffer loss of some of Denver's last affordable housing and be unable to buy anything else in this area of high-cost homes. There is no independent agency to help those being approached by CDOT with offers to buy their properties, and may be unaware that they can negotiate with CDOT. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 says that any Federally financed project must be carried out in the best overall public interest. As a resident of Denver, I object to the disruption and division of these neighborhoods. I don't see how it can be in their best interest, and it is not in the best interest of the City of Denver to have less affordable housing in stable neighborhoods close to the city core. Home ownership in these neighborhoods is very high, which is a good thing for Denver and for these low-income neighbors. They have endured a lot over the years, and exposing them to the impact of this Proposed Alternative is unfair in the extreme. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS The SEIS does not provide information on the disposal of 1.8 million yards of contaminated soil. Where will this hazardous material go? Which communities will be affected? How will they be protected? There has been no analysis on the environmental impact of 50,000 to 75,000 round trips by trucks full of dirt or equipment being used to expand I-70. Yet, there will most certainly be several years' impact on air quality and exposure to hazardous materials. How will the project meet Denver's 2020 Sustainability Goals, which mandate a decrease in energy consumption? I urge CDOT, Denver City Council, and other elected and appointed officials to step back from their Preferred Alternative, and take time to address my concerns, those of my neighbors, and the issues raised in the APA Peer Review Report. If that is done, I feel sure that the Preferred Alternative will be shelved in favor of options that far better fit Denver's needs and objectives.

Dear Sir, Madam, It disturbs me, that in a time when Colorado and Denver governments pay at least lip service to environmental protection, social justice and civil rights, and in a time where driving is trending down, we are even considering such an incredibly expensive and un-needed project as this. CDOT's proposed project violates the principles of environmental protection, social justice and responsible government (fiscal responsibility). I specifically request that CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. This has not been studied by CDOT, and I would like to know why. It is my understanding that CDOT already owns the needed right-of-ways along this route, eliminating the need to displace residents and businesses or demolish historic buildings. I am also not in favor of the proposed Private Public Partnership. The current proposal does not provide sufficient benefit to the public compared to the added cost and added impact in terms of lost homes, negative environmental consequences for Swansea Elementary and losses on home values. The Civil Rights Act would have made it illegal to place the highway where it is today. The same socially disadvantaged populations will be affected by further expanding I-70 in the same place. It is not just; in fact, it would be shameful. Would it also be illegal under the Civil Rights act? I'm very concerned by CDOT appearing to capitalize on the fact that the communities impacted by this development may not be as aware or as vocal in community affairs as residents in more prosperous neighborhoods in Denver are. There seem to be inconsistencies between what the affected communities are saying about this project and what CDOT claims they are saying. One could hardly imagine CDOT trying to widen the 6th Avenue Freeway through the North Country Club neighborhood and claiming that neighbors were supportive of this idea. Why is that OK here? Finally, I am disturbed by reports that CDOT is already considering an expansion to I-70 west of I-25. How many homes and what parks will be lost when this, inevitable, next step in this bad plan becomes necessary? It appears that CDOT is neglecting to account for any cars joining I-70 from I-25. This appears unrealistic, and I would like to see those calculations revised and presented to the public. As a taxpayer, I am appalled that this outrageous project spend is considered, and I can't help wonder in whose best interest is this project, if it is not in the general public's? Engineering companies? CDOT staff's? The mayor's? Private investors? Other cities in the US have found it beneficial to re-route major highways with significant through traffic to areas outside cities, with lower population densities, thus reducing the health implications on the population and freeing up valuable city land for useful development. I urge Denver and Colorado to follow their leadership. Thank you

Barring the development of additional information to the contrary, I opposed the preferred alternative for several reasons: - The air quality impacts on the neighborhood and the school, in particular, have not been documented to not pose health impacts (e.g., asthma, respiratory problems, etc.) - Excavation is likely to impact and expose historically contaminated groundwater which will need to be managed at an undetermined (high) cost to prevent human and environmental exposure. - The design is likely to create a flooding hazard should we experience unusually high rainfall events such as those that occurred in the fall of 2013. It makes no sense to "bury" the interstate and create conditions that will be ripe for infrastructure and property damage, let alone public risk. - The Preliminary Identified Preferred Alternative does nothing to connect Globeville/Swansea/Elyria to the core city to the south. The neighborhood has been physically isolated from the potential for favorable development because of its historic isolation. With the recent Trammell Crow purchase of the Asarco site, plans for redevelopment of the stockshow property, etc., will be less successful if the area remains cut off from easy access to downtown and the exciting development in RINO, Brighton Blvd, etc. This is a major social justice issue as well as a lost opportunity for more enhanced economic development. - I appreciate City Council's raising the issue of impacts to the students at Swansea Elementary, and recommending they be removed from the impacts of noise, air pollution, traffic, etc., during the highway development. But it is inappropriate to bus children out of their neighborhood for years to protect them from unnecessary risks. All different alternative would not present health risks to the children at all.



Comment 1: We wish to express our serious concerns about the Colorado Department of Transportation's proposal to widen Interstate 70 in north Denver because of the devastation it will create in the mostly impoverished and Hispanic neighborhoods of Elyria-Swansea and Globeville between Colorado Boulevard and I-25. Comment 2: Widening Interstate 70 in this corridor will significantly increase the public health threat that the highway's presence already poses to residents in these neighborhoods. The City of Denver's Health Impact Assessment showed that currently, residents living within 500 feet of the present highway experience significant pollution exposure, creating asthma levels over 40%, compared to 28% citywide. Comment 3: Two elementary schools (Swansea and Garden Place) are within this 500-foot distance from I-70. Widening the highway will exacerbate these health concerns for children attending these schools. Comment 4: These neighborhoods, like others along the I-70 corridor, are burdened with air contaminants and greenhouse gas emissions, causing high incidence of respiratory illness and other chronic disease that result in early death. Widening I-70 will result in expanding the zone of serious air quality and health impacts further into these neighborhoods. Comment 5: We believe this proposal will seriously fracture the cohesiveness of these neighborhoods. Elyria-Swansea and Globeville have yet to recover from the damage of when I-70 was first constructed fifty years ago. Numerous homes and local businesses were removed, and this access-limiting highway separated close-knit families and neighborhoods. The communities became detached from the rest of city and had to live with the negative effects of an elevated viaduct, including dirt, air pollution, noise, and shadows. This proposal of widening I-70 to more than 300 feet in width will remove the families living on 7 of 14 core blocks in Elyria displacing at least fifty families and will create further barriers between families and neighbors living north and south of the proposed expanded highway. Comment 6: Currently, there is no proposal for helping replace the housing stock that this project will remove with comparably priced housing in the same area. Displaced homeowners will not be equipped to find similar housing, and certainly not near the same neighborhood. This is a serious disruption of an already damaged social environment. Comment 7: Engineering that does not start with an understanding of neighborhoods and people is bad engineering. Engineering that does not advance community values and which results in displacement is social engineering at its worst. Comment 8: We oppose this proposal not only because it is unjust but also because it is immoral for what it does to the disenfranchised of our city. These neighborhoods will receive no significant social or environmental benefits with the approval of this proposal. Comment 9: This project does not improve connectivity, improve health and wellness of residents, make the community more livable nor provide benefits for improved mobility, especially given the high proportion of residents who do not own or operate motor vehicles. Comment 10: We request that the Colorado Department of Transportation develop a solution that listens to the needs and wants of those who live in these neighborhoods. We seek an outcome that does not displace homes, families, or businesses in these neighborhoods. Comment 11: We seek a solution that demonstrably improves the health and wellness of residents beyond conditions that exist today that is, a solution that results in measurably better health conditions for residents, school children, workers and visitors to these neighborhoods. Comment 12: We request a solution that improves mobility and accessibility of residents of these neighborhoods, that does not continue to rely on fossil fuel technology, and provides instead new investments in transit, sidewalk completion, separation of railways, and bicycle connections. Comment 13: We request a solution that focuses foremost on improved connectivity within these neighborhoods and repairing the damage caused by locating I-70 here more than 50 years ago. Comment 14: We strongly affirm that investing in making these communities more complete, more vibrant, and healthier should be the city and state's priority, not damaging them further through this misguided proposal.

I oppose CDOT's plan to widen I-70. I encourage CDOT to explore other options, specifically the I-270 and I-76 reroute. I would also request that CDOT perform a SEIS on this study as well as all other studies for I-70. No traffic dictates the encroachment on school property or the children that attend the school, Swansea elementary should not be altered in any way unless it is for the betterment of the school and the neighborhood. No dwellings should be demolished unless the owner is fully compensated with enough capital to relocate to a neighborhood that is desirable. The proposed atrocity by CDOT will expose the city of Denver as well as the immediate residents to harmful levels of contaminated earth that is already declared a superfund site by the EPA, in fact there are more than one. CDOT has not disclosed this in their report and it certainly is not within the budget. I would like a boulevard that will show Denver as a remarkable city, with the promotion of walkability, biking, and various methods of public transport such as commuter train, light rail, and busses. Why has CDOT and other city officials not recognized the original plans set forth for 46th avenue. I would like to see this area developed much like Stapleton and Lowry have been. CDOT please disclose truthful and adequate information to the residents in all the neighborhoods affected about air quality, soil contamination, and please do so by physically knocking on doors with both Spanish and English speaking representatives. What has been proposed is a disaster and will be a major loss for Denver, Colorado, and all of its citizens both economically, socially, and structurally. Review the original plans CDOT discussed between 2004 and 2008, where a boulevard was examined. There is no need nor is there a demand for managed, toll, Lexus lanes. Please disclose to the public who is helping pay for these un-wanted lanes as well. Please put this topic to the public and the entire state of Colorado as a vote, before any further disaster occurs. CDOT, please look for a win-win for the people of Colorado, the city of Denver, the neighborhoods that will be affected, especially Globeville, Swansea, Elyria, and Sunnyside. Thanks and Happy Halloween.

ALTERNATE OPTION Alternate options (particularly the I-76/I-270 re-route) should be legitimately considered. The analysis provided in the Alternative Analysis Technical report (Attachment C) appears to be poorly conducted and generated to automatically benefit the I-70 expansion. Parts of the I-270/I-76 route will already need expansion. It appears that parts of the cost are double counted for the re-route alternative. The estimated \$4.3 billion cost seems incongruous compared to the T-REX expansion on I-25, as well as the I-70 mountain proposal. Credible analysis of the alternative option needs to be addressed. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH The project discusses temporary environmental health remediation, but does not seem to address the long term impacts. Environmental health and its impact needs to be considered through the entire life of the highway. Especially when it is directed through residences. To make the argument that environmental impacts for the new expansion is no worse than current conditions is a poor excuse, when the current condition is already creating an adverse and unhealthy environment. The temporary remediation efforts at Swansea Elementary school highlight additional health concerns.

Discussion of improved HVAC systems for the Swansea school seems to be an incomplete solution in addressing children's health. If construction for the project is implemented in the evening/night time, there is no benefit in these suggested mitigation measures when children are home or outside. Air quality impact for the park/open space on the partial covered surface (if it's even provided), is another concern for environmental health. There seems to be a contrary statement toward Denver's climate action plan for this project. Denver has pledged in the US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement to curb greenhouse gas. The section on greenhouse gas in the EIS comes off as a purposeless statement. If C-DOT is anticipating increased traffic in this project, then there should be an assessment in looking at impacts in emissions from this increase. This project considers a highway expansion, and needs to include pollutants associated with air pollution emissions from highway vehicles. Vehicle exhaust has shown to have harmful effects and NOx, SOx, PM2.5 should be properly assessed at localized levels not just at regional levels. The EIS's statement that only ozone and PM10 is of concern in the Denver region does not examine the local neighborhood impacts where there is the highest concentration of pollution. Particulate matter 2.5 needs greater assessment and should also look at the monitoring location of Denver-Swansea Elementary school. Despite CAMP being considered representative of neighborhood scale, the monitoring location at Swansea school is much more relevant to area impacts. EXPANSION The planned expansion to double the current width is excessive. C-DOT's plan for a "100 year" expansion seems to be based on assumptions that future mobility will be provided with vehicles only. Future forecasts need to consider alternate modes of transportation planning increases such as mass public transportation. Is expansion of the east-bound commuter rail considered in the planning efforts in future use forecasts? The cost of the cut and cover expansion is expensive. If the intention is to improve mobility for people, it would seem that Denver's funds would be better suited towards improved public transportation rather than a dramatic expansion of such a traditional highway.

As a lifetime resident of North Denver I think I know what I say when I tell you that you would never have had to "reconnect" the neighborhoods if you hadn't divided them in the first place. If you take a video of the stretch of I-76 from Wheatridge to 225 you will see nothing but commercial industry. No homes, no old neighborhoods. If you video tape the same stretch of highway on I-70 you see nothing but old neighborhoods, historic landmarks, and beautiful parks. Every night I walk around Berkeley Lake. The noise from the traffic is so terrible that I usually only walk on the grass side. Why can't you reroute this whole mess to Adams County? Is there some political reason for not moving the highway? It makes no sense to have parallel highways so close together. Please use common sense and get this dragon out of North Denver!

We are concerned about the increased air pollution during and after construction and the impact on the health of surrounding community members. We are also very disappointed that the SEIS did not explore a re-route option. Re-routing would right the historic wrong of dividing this once vibrant community. The EIS should look more closely at the potential for hazardous materials to be released during the construction. The construction plan also seems to create the same potential for flash flooding as we have already experienced on I-25. I am also concerned about the increase in traffic and congestion funneling into I-70 after I-25 and what that will do to that surrounding community. Please do not create a problem that will result in widening I-70 farther west. CDOT should conduct further investigation of the re-route option or leave the area the same.

Please re-route I-70 through the commercial area. Widening the interstate will disrupt many neighborhoods. Our neighborhoods will be greatly affected by this decision; please move I-70 and make the current one a boulevard. Thank you for your time

I favor the re-route from I-70 to I-76 and 270. I think the re-route will have less impact on the surrounding neighborhoods and also be less costly. The additional lanes will expand the width of the existing highway by 3 times. Other cities who have re-routed city highways have had successful results. Look at San Francisco and Oklahoma City. The city of Denver would be even better if the northern neighborhoods were not divided by a massive highway.

Air Quality: More driving create bad air quality. Americans, including Coloradoans are driving less. There is no good reason to expand lanes to increase capacity for cars that don't exist. Why is this necessary? Environmental Justice: The people directly affected who suffered before and are suffering now will suffer again from displacement and in the future because these changes will simply increase traffic in the area. These are the poorest of the poor. They live near highways, factories, and refineries. How is that just? Financing: CDOT is playing fast and loose with the numbers. They don't have the money. They won't have the money. They will borrow it, selling off tolls in a P3 arrangement to a company that could eventually fail, leaving tax payers holding the bag. Tell the truth about the real costs. How is this honest or fair? Hazardous Materials: This area is already polluted. It sits in a river basin. Dredging and carrying away contaminants will further infect the people and wildlife, further degrading the health and welfare of the residents closest to the affected areas. And, increase traffic along the route increases the potential for future accidents including injuries, deaths, and damage to cargo both hazardous and non-hazardous. Why should this area, among the most contaminated in and around Denver, suffer for decades and generations? Historic: Historic neighborhoods in and around Denver exhibit structures and features that comport with our illustrious history. Many of these magnificent places represent the dearest and noble traits. Yet, the historic districts affected by the I-70 expansion fail to prosper to the same economic degree. Why is CDOT so willing to further degrade an historically significant place, including the buildings that showcase these neighborhood simply for the purpose of progress? Managed Lanes: The managed lanes are Lexus Lanes. The creation of these amenities simply exacerbates the tiering of services for those who can afford to pay. Politicians who lack the guts to tax appropriately balance the burden on others to pay fees. This amounts to a tax subsidy for the rich. When will CDOT tell the truth about toll lanes? Noise: More lanes mean more noise. I know. I live 1 block south of I-70. The drone of vehicles lulls me to sleep every night. And, it will just be a matter of time before CDOT expands I-70 to the west. In the interim, this expansion will create traffic jams as 10 lanes merge to 6 lanes. This is insane. It will create more maddening noise, choking pollution and chronic sickness that will reduce the lives and livelihoods of people who live in close proximity to the I-70. How many people will this expansion kill in the future? Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative: The best alternative is a re-route of I-70 onto I-270 and I-76. Yet, we are told that CDOT eliminated this option. That CDOT has to expand these interstates in order to perform the I-70 expansion shows the redundancy of such efforts? How much time and money will CDOT waste performing the same work twice? The data is old. The conclusions are wrong. Get it right. Property Impacts : Yet again, property will be taken, families displaced and businesses destroyed. Denver is in the midst of fantastic re-urbanization that creates more value than and I-70 expansion could ever contribute. Why can't Colorado, including the Denver Metro Area understand that interstate highways don't create urban value? Swansea Elementary: Yet again, school children will pay the heaviest price, as they have for decades. When it comes to spending money on programs to assist childhood health, why do American ignore preventative care? Is it because there is no money to be made in preventing disease before it begins? It is insane to let children play anywhere near an interstate highway, and it is ludicrous to assume that playing on top of one is better than adjacent to one. Visual: I-70 in my neighborhood, Berkeley is an eyesore. Yet, West 46th Avenue, a fantastic boulevard is beautifully tree-lined. We walk our dogs on that street every day. Denver deserves better than Brutalist concrete ugliness. Truck Traffic: Truck traffic along I-70 is appropriately moved to I-270 and I-76 because these areas are already lined with heavy and light industrial buildings and warehouses. Moving truck traffic there provides a perfect fit for large vehicles and the businesses that depend upon them for deliveries. The extra mileage traveled for long-haulers is miniscule. Other: The peer review and white paper produced by the American Planning Association reveals the countless mistakes that CDOT, the DRCOG and the City and County of Denver have made thus far in opaquely ramrodding this project through the process. This project is replete with errors in research, methodology, data, judgment, organization, communication, and coordination. We deserve better. Get it right. The price for getting it wrong will haunt the Denver Metropolitan Area for decades. When I emailed the APA white paper to James Howard Kunstler (esteemed author and regular commentator on urbanism) he replied, a "Complete waste of public money, spending billions for gold-plated infrastructure for Happy Motoring in its twilight years. I couldn't have said it better myself. Waste of money. Waste of time. What is this so difficult for CDOT planners to grasp? Is it because road building for automobile transport is the bad habit CDOT cannot shake? For the sake of the planet, please stop.

It is very discouraging that CDOT continues to shove a proposal down our throats that only they support. In a time of unparalleled prosperity in metro Denver, this proposal threatens to halt the growth of many north Denver neighborhoods. The I70 expansion singles out north Denver as the clear loser in CDOT's desire to turn more space into interstate. The increased pollution caused by the expansion is a threat to all those living near the interstate. And now you want to place park on top of the interstate??? You want our children to play on top of a pile of exhaust, tire fragments, and other hazardous materials??? Do you have any idea how asinine that sounds? I know CDOT has paid someone to tell us how it is safe, but does anyone really believe this? As a former south Denver resident I have seen CDOT blow tons of money on the Santa Fe/I25 ramp. What has that project solved? Why should I have confidence in CDOT to come up with a logical proposal for I70? This isn't even taking into account that it is highly doubtful that any project involving CDOT comes in at budget. With all the money at stake, this isn't just a risk for north Denver, this is a risk for all of Colorado. Lastly, I would like to hear why CDOT is hell bent on ignoring the public's cry for a feasibility study on a reroute of I70. The reroute would go through areas without neighborhoods and would not negatively impact anyone. The expansion has real life consequences to all those living near this monstrosity. Please stop lending a deaf ear to the reroute.

Dear CDOT folks. I am a concerned citizen and resident of North Denver. I am very concerned about the proposed widening project of I 70 through our beloved city. In my opinion the environmental and community impact could be could be devastating. This is the time to look at other alternatives including rerouting some of the through traffic to I 76. I would like to see that alternative reconsidered and more community and environmentally friendly options considered for the existing section of the highway through Swansea. I think Smart progressive planning could make Denver a city to watch for innovative ideas. Let's not repeat the mistakes of the past. Enlist the best and brightest collaborate team that we have in this great state. We deserve it.

I oppose CDOT's current preferred alternative. I support studying the alternative that would reroute I-70 to 270/76 and retrofit I-70 between 270 and 76 as a high capacity, at grade, multimodal, multiway boulevard. The findings of the American Planning Association clarify the flaws in the travel model and land use forecasts used as the basis to justify CDOT's preferred alternative. The APA report also points out the lack of systems thinking employed to date in the EIS process. Finally the APA report highlights that utter lack of common sense involved in the bottleneck that CDOT's preferred alternative will create. I concur with the findings of the APA report. NEPA affords protections against environmental racism and requires that all reasonable alternatives be studied in the context of the EIS. CDOT's research is outdated, flawed and insufficient to justify their preferred alternative without violating the spirit and intent of NEPA. I demand improvements to the study methodology as recommended by the APA report and I demand the inclusion of the reroute/retrofit alternative sufficient to make a meaningful comparison to CDOT's preferred alternative.

Please place courage and leadership over cowardice and corruption. The research is there to support what should be self evident, there is a clearly less costly solution to provide these sought after additional traffic lanes which is demonstrably more socially just, less costly, and provides greater opportunity for the citizens of Denver and Colorado. Simply put, utilize and expand the existing right of way along 276 and I-76 and relabel them I-70. I deferred to the many others in this community who have already addressed the very concerning aspects of the environmental impact study and rightly questioned the processes and tactics that have been used by CDOT and others, thus far, to justify exacerbating and prolonging the injustice served on the communities bisected by I-70. Clearly those in power at the State and City level, specifically Hickenlooper, Hancock, Montero, Shepherd, Brooks, and Don Hunt lack the courage or integrity to fight and advocate for what's right for Denver and Colorado, similarly the state-certified employees at CDOT routinely opt preserve jobs security by doing as told and failing to consider common sense solutions provided by the real world, factual data not supporting their conclusions. At some level it's like a room full of climate change deniers. In both cases, I expect the EPA to step in. The federal government should not support the unexplained special interests of a few local politicians at the expense of families and lives harmed by a mistake made the last time this issue came up. There is a clear and better alternative, and is time a big stakeholder in this process stand up and say so.

I am currently a transportation PhD student at the University of Colorado Denver in the Civil Engineering department. I am conducting my research on evaluating current travel behavior and understanding the implications of new transportation services and infrastructure in creating more sustainable and equitable transportation systems. I have several concerns in regards to the I-70 East EIS but this specific comment focus in one in particular. This specific concern is regarding the travel demand model and the traffic volume forecast assumption. The EIS states forecasts for the year 2035 show that traffic volume on I-70 will increase substantially. The forecast ranges from 117,000 to 285,000 vehicles per day depending on the location in the corridor. Checking in more detail about the forecast numbers, CDOT states that they used DRCOG old travel demand model and DRCOG old future forecast for 2035. It is understandable that at the time of the initial study CDOT and DRCOG used what it was available. However, this was several years ago and currently in 2014 there are new and updated travel demand models and forecast numbers. I am very familiar with forecast travel demand modeling, and transportation professionals that work in this area acknowledge that the model outcomes are very sensitive to the initial inputs (i.e. assumptions, forecast volumes). In other words, we could get completely different results and recommendations for a future transportation project depending on what the modeler put as inputs and the travel demand model he/she uses. The I-70 East EIS study is one example of this problem; CDOT and DRCOG used old forecast projections and an old travel demand model. In the past traffic engineers have projected very high vehicle miles travel (VMT) for traffic demand model forecast. These days we have realized that these VMT projections were incorrect because they are not matching real world values. As several studies have shown we are experiencing a different trend over recent years; there are new travel behavior preferences where VMT is actually decreasing. Millennials (those born between 1983 and 2000) are the nation's largest generation, making transportation needs very important. They are driving less and prefer to use other modes of transportation including transit, biking, walking, and new transportation services such as bike-sharing, car-sharing and ride-sharing services (i.e. Uber, Lyft, Carma). It is important to notice that even in areas where there is significant population growth, VMT is not increasing at all. Luckily, several transportation engineers and professionals are paying attention to these changes and understand the need to update our transportation system. For example, the Washington Department of Transportation (DOT) is adopting a new transportation model to reflect better and reduced VMT forecast to provide a more complete transportation system with less dependency on highway capacity. In regards to the I-70 East EIS study if more realistic, lower traffic forecast numbers were used the results would have been different. The results would have included options that are more environmental friendly, more economical responsible, and a lot less impacts to the community. With this concern in mind, I have the following questions: Why forecast traffic volume was not updated to reflect more realistic and current trends in the U.S.? Why did CDOT and DRCOG not use a newer travel demand model? Was an 8-lane cross section (three general purpose lanes and one managed lane in each direction) ever tested using the DRCOG travel demand model? Was an alternative that did not include frontage roads on both sides ever tested? Was traffic induced by the 10-lane section accounted for the travel demand model? Previous studies have proven that by providing more road capacity the traffic volume increase. In contrast, if you provide less highway lanes and instead improve other modes of transportation infrastructure such as transit, bicycling or pedestrian, less traffic is induced. Why other modes of transportation (i.e. transit, bicycling, walking) and other infrastructure were not included in the travel demand model and project? What are operational characteristics such as level of services (LOS) for different sections of I-70 in the forecast? Other studies have demonstrated bottleneck issues going from higher-lanes to lower-lanes. CDOT really need to evaluate the travel demand model and the traffic volume forecast assumption used for this study. By correcting the traffic volume projection to reflect more realistic values, CDOT engineers would be able to do a better evaluation of the current proposed option with less lanes and a smaller footprint and/or include other alternatives that were not analyzed in the EIS study. For example, I would like to see an option that takes into consideration less dependency on driving and more inclusive to other modes of transportation that are better for the environment, more sustainable, more inclusive, more equitable, and more economical and financially responsible. Instead of repeating the mistakes of the past by adding more highway lanes and end up in more congested areas, Denver should be replicating what progressive cities like New York, Washington D.C., Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, to name a few, are doing. They are providing a more complete transportation system, inclusive of several transportation modes. These cities are becoming more livable, sustainable, resilient, healthier, equitable, and more vibrant. They are providing what their citizens want and also are attracting more people. Denver and Colorado in general is a great place to live but the current preferable CDOT option does not align with the goal of creating a more sustainable transportation system. As Janette Sadik-Khan, former Commissioner of the New York City Department of Transportation, affirms: the choices we make today for designing our streets have worldwide implications for the future. The I-70 East project is a huge opportunity to correct the mistakes from the past (instead of making it worse) and provide a legacy for the future generations. That is one of the reasons I am doing a PhD in civil engineering, transportation, to be able to provide current, better solutions and outcomes for our communities. Denver shall be providing transportation infrastructure that matches the current trends and demands from the community. It should aim to provide prosperity and continue to attract more people, including millennials, for this great place to live, work, and enjoy.

To Whom it May Concern;

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed expansion on I-70. I grew up in California and I have seen how these freeway expansions rarely result in an improvement in traffic. The recent I-25 expansions has further confirmed that.

I also am concerned of how this will impact a historic neighborhood both from an economic and health perspective. I feel really fortunate to live in a great place like Denver, and I have been really impressed by many of the initiatives around town, especially Fast Tracks. It seems like Denver is following a different path than other western cities that are dominated by cars and traffic. But this particular project seems like what I have seen in many other western states, where the quality of life is compromised by too much traffic.

I hope you will consider other possibilities rather than the I-70 expansion, and thank you for your consideration.

Please consider rerouting I70 through the more Industrial part of Denver/Adams County. I am very upset that the typical M.O. for our bureaucrats and politicians is to make major decisions that negatively affect their constituents without publicly and predominantly announcing such big plans to give the general public an opportunity to be involved. Deals are made behind closed doors that affect peoples lives. Not only will more people lose their homes, and the Swansea/Elyria neighborhood further harmed by toxic fumes and poisonous particles in soils, not to mention further divide this neighborhood. From what I've seen of the proposed reroute, it makes so much more sense than putting the tunnel underground and widening lanes. Please reconsider your plans and take into consideration other, less intrusive, alternatives. Also, going further, perhaps you should involve the public. Thank you!

This is to submit my public comment for I-70. I am a member of LiveWell Globeville, Elyria, Swansea and have also signed onto a letter that addresses the multiple impacts of the plans to widen I-70. I have been a resident of Swansea for the past ten years and take issue with a number of items in the Environmental Impact Statement. Among my concerns are that the environmental impact statement does not adequately address mitigation for homeowners, the increased levels of all pollutants, the longstanding issues that residents will have to deal with regarding construction including noise and pollution, the impact on connectivity to the neighborhood, the long term impact on home values, the increased safety hazards of construction for families and children, and the continued impact of apathy and urban blight that effects the area leading to higher crime and a lower quality of life for residents in the neighborhood. I have consistently supported the study of a re-route along I-76 and 270 which has not adequately been pursued. I have no doubt that the widening of I-70 will have a cumulative negative effect on the neighborhood. While it appears to address the short term needs of commuters, long term there are many more negative impacts to the health, safety, and quality of life for Denver residents.

If it comes to this, cannot houses built before 1905 be lifted from their foundations and stored off-site on chocks or dollies and restored to foundations in Elyria-Swansea after your "big dig," so that the loss of Denver's history is not catastrophic? Many forget that Italian masons often set the brick walls and Swedish carpenters built cabinets and fit windows and doors. Wall plaster was hand-applied in three coats. The participation of struggling immigrants, was what "made" Denver. The loss of this hurts us all.

While residents in the neighborhood are fully aware that CDOT and the City of Denver have a responsibility to reconstruct the I-70 highway, we demand that CDOT and the City of Denver acknowledge the residents who live and work in the area and the primary, secondary and tertiary effects a 10-lane highway expansion would place on the residents and businesses in the area. The residents in the area of impact are 84% of Hispanic and socio-economic range of the residents is disproportionately lower to the rest of the City of Denver. This is from your own statistics. Yet you would only offer mitigation of the Swansea Elementary School and offer loans to residents who may not even qualify or have the ability to satisfy those loans? It is yet another case of a city that is using its power overbearingly without full consideration of the facts or offering suitable and realistic mitigation proposals to a population who will be adversely impacted, whether intentional or unintentional according to Title VI of the U.S.C. Toll lanes unintentionally and almost always inherently create disparate impact in that benefits are not equally distributed to all communities. (Prozzi, Victoria, Torres, Walton Prozzi, 2006, TxDOT Project 0-5208: Evaluating of Environmental Justice Aspects of the Tolling of Existing Non-Toll Roads) We will not have the benefit of availability of non-toll roads. There is an environmental justice concern when: a) the minority or low-income population exceeds 50 percent of the impacted area, b) The minority or low-income population percentage in the impacted area is meaningfully greater than the minority or low-income population in the general population or other appropriate geographic area and c) There is more than one minority or low-income group present and the minority or low-income percentage, as calculated by summing all minority or low-income persons meets one of the thresholds presented above (The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines (1997). (Prozzi, et al, 2006) Where is CDOT and the City of Denver's answer to this? I am please CDOT knows what EJ is, but defining it in an overview is NOT a study. What are the actions to mitigate or offset the burdens imposed by toll projects and construction? Displaced residential properties, remaining residential properties, property values and neighborhood attractiveness due to tolls, neighborhood traffic patterns, access to and from work, fair share of contracts generated by the project earmarked for local business, return toll revenue to low-income households in the form of reduced regressive taxes and improved social services, redistribute toll revenues according to income, etc. ten lanes diminishes our community and would result in an even greater loss of cohesion in Elyria and adjacent neighborhoods. What is CDOT and the City of Denver's overall aggregate and analytic study of this? What are the inferences concerning population proportions? What are the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts? The current HIA statement is disingenuous to the real plight of the area's residents. It only benefits the City of Denver, CDOT, its funding agents, and the majority population who who can economically sustain it. If this is the case, it is in fact a Title VI and Environmental Justice violation.

I would like to encourage CDOT to consider the serious repercussions of widening I-70 to the communities of Elyria-Swansea and Globeville. These communities have already been irrevocably altered by the construction of the interstate and have experienced fragmentation, displacement of community members, air and noise pollution, and generally lowered quality of life from their proximity to a major thoroughfare. These communities will be further damaged by an expansion of the highway, and will see no tangible benefit as a result of the construction. I ask that CDOT consider other transportation solutions that focus on improving the well being and quality of life of local residents. I have copied the comments submitted by Iliff School of Theology below, because I believe that the perspective offered is critically important in this discussion and that the comments are worth re-reading. Thank you for your time and consideration, Casey Flynn Comment 1: We wish to express our serious concerns about the Colorado Department of Transportation's proposal to widen Interstate 70 in north Denver because of the devastation it will create in the mostly impoverished and Hispanic neighborhoods of Elyria-Swansea and Globeville between Colorado Boulevard and I-25. Comment 2: Widening Interstate 70 in this corridor will significantly increase the public health threat that the highway's presence already poses to residents in these neighborhoods. The City of Denver's Health Impact Assessment showed that currently, residents living within 500 feet of the present highway experience significant pollution exposure, creating asthma levels over 40%, compared to 28% citywide. Comment 3: Two elementary schools (Swansea and Garden Place) are within this 500-foot distance from I-70. Widening the highway will exacerbate these health concerns for children attending these schools. Comment 4: These neighborhoods, like others along the I-70 corridor, are burdened with air contaminants and greenhouse gas emissions, causing high incidence of respiratory illness and other chronic disease that result in early death. Widening I-70 will result in expanding the zone of serious air quality and health impacts further into these neighborhoods. Comment 5: We believe this proposal will seriously fracture the cohesiveness of these neighborhoods. Elyria-Swansea and Globeville have yet to recover from the damage of when I-70 was first constructed fifty years ago. Numerous homes and local businesses were removed, and this access-limiting highway separated close-knit families and neighborhoods. The communities became detached from the rest of city and had to live with the negative effects of an elevated viaduct, including dirt, air pollution, noise, and shadows. This proposal of widening I-70 to more than 300 feet in width will remove the families living on 7 of 14 core blocks in Elyria displacing at least fifty families and will create further barriers between families and neighbors living north and south of the proposed expanded highway. Comment 6: Currently, there is no proposal for helping replace the housing stock that this project will remove with comparably priced housing in the same area. Displaced homeowners will not be equipped to find similar housing, and certainly not near the same neighborhood. This is a serious disruption of an already damaged social environment. Comment 7: Engineering that does not start with an understanding of neighborhoods and people is bad engineering. Engineering that does not advance community values and which results in displacement is social engineering at its worst. Comment 8: We oppose this proposal not only because it is unjust but also because it is immoral for what it does to the disenfranchised of our city. These neighborhoods will receive no significant social or environmental benefits with the approval of this proposal. Comment 9: This project does not improve connectivity, improve health and wellness of residents, make the community more livable nor provide benefits for improved mobility, especially given the high proportion of residents who do not own or operate motor vehicles. Comment 10: We request that the Colorado Department of Transportation develop a solution that listens to the needs and wants of those who live in these neighborhoods. We seek an outcome that does not displace homes, families, or businesses in these neighborhoods. Comment 11: We seek a solution that demonstrably improves the health and wellness of residents beyond conditions that exist today that is, a solution that results in measurably better health conditions for residents, school children, workers and visitors to these neighborhoods. Comment 12: We request a solution that improves mobility and accessibility of residents of these neighborhoods, that does not continue to rely on fossil fuel technology, and provides instead new investments in transit, sidewalk completion, separation of railways, and bicycle connections. Comment 13: We request a solution that focuses foremost on improved connectivity within these neighborhoods and repairing the damage caused by locating I-70 here more than 50 years ago. Comment 14: We strongly affirm that investing in making these communities more complete, more vibrant, and healthier should be the city and state's priority, not damaging them further through this misguided proposal.

Please do not expand I-70 East into Downtown Denver. It will ruin the air quality in our neighborhood and will disrupt hazardous materials in the Globeville area. Specifically I believe that the Boulevard option along the I 76 route into downtown is a much better option for our neighborhoods. I know that cities like San Francisco have utilized the Boulevard concept which has increased businesses and property values in the area, rather than rebuilding larger highways into downtown. The traffic in Denver is a mess due to all of the expansion in the last 10 years and we need alternative routes and better mass transit in the metro area and into the ski areas.

The incredible amount of \$ this project will consume. Many believe it to be grossly-fiscally irresponsible spending from a taxpayer perspective, especially when the re-route appears it will cost about half as much while addressing I-70 congestion issues on BOTH sides of I-25, not just the east side.

Why was the full re-route that is on both I-270 & I-76 not studied as a part of this SEIS

Get with the times "Planning based upon the real trends of today vs. using the trends of the 1950s & 1960s. People want to be in the City these days. Many people don't want to ride the traffic sewer to far-out suburbs the way they once did. Millennials want to be close to work. Millennials and many more want to use mass transit and many don't even want to own cars.

High Price projects should have gone to the tax payer for approval. Please explain the logic behind bypassing the taxpayer in order to fund this project?

CDOT already owns the right-of-way needed to widen I-76 and I-270, without taking any homes or businesses and, along the I-76 and I-270 routes there are 0 neighborhoods that are immediately-adjacent to the freeways, compared to 11 along I-70 between Stapleton's Central Park Blvd and Harlan [the re-route area] that are directly impacted

Attached are my comments on the I-70 SDEIS. I also hand-delivered a printed copy to the CDOT office 2000 South Holly at about 11:45AM today October 31 2014.

CDOT claims that it studied the I-270/I-76 reroute and determined that the reroute would cost more than the current cut and cover. Cynthia Thorstad from the League of Women Voters did a financial comparison of the two routes, using CDOT numbers with review and input from subject matter experts. Thorstad's report found that CDOT had double-billed improvements to the I-270 leg and that the cost-per-mile for the reroute was considerably higher than corresponding costs for similar projects. The fact that CDOT already owns the right of way for I-270 apparently was not used. The ONLY way that this issue can be resolved is to create an SEIS for the reroute and compare apples to apples, etc. Experts have gone on record that this additional SEIS could be done in 12 months for a cost of about \$1,000,000.00.

Two historic Denver neighborhoods that have already been impacted by the initial construction of I-70 serve to be further degraded if the proposed plan to widen and recess I-70 continues. Air quality in Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea is ready among the lowest in the city of Denver and residents suffer correspondingly high rates of asthma. Even more disturbing is the location of Swansea Elementary immediately adjacent to the proposed path of the freeway which will sit less than 100 feet to the south. The partial cover smacks of greenwashing by providing amenities for only a small section of what will be a miles-long gash with few options for crossing on foot or transit, leaving the residents most affected by the construction of the highway with fewer north-south mobility options than at present. Do we really need to benefit out of state through traffic at the expense of Colorado residents? Denver is also actively growing and attracting young residents looking for an urban city that is walkable and transit-oriented. It seems ludicrous that CDOT would look not to the future growth and population of the state but to outdated trends in freeway expansion. Tripling the current width of I-70 would permanently disconnect the surrounding neighborhoods from the city, particularly those north of the freeway, and would do nothing to solve the increased congestion that would result from only the portion east of I-25 being widened. For these reasons, I call for CDOT to conduct an SEIS on the full reroute that includes both I-270 and I-76. Utilizing the existing freeway right of way that sits fully outside of the urban fabric of the city would be a win for both North Denver residents and the through traffic utilizing I-70 that would not encounter a reduction in lane numbers west of I-25.

CDOT claims that the current I-70 expansion plan has been under development since 2008. I have been attending "most" of the public meetings on this matter for the last 18 months, including the City Council meetings, the NDCC meetings and various "public input" meetings in Swansea. When I raised questions about the I-270/I-76 reroute, no CDOT or City or contractor representative was able to discuss it, understandably so, because of lack of knowledge. However, CDOT and the City representatives both claimed that the reroute was rejected because of cost. How is it that no one is knowledgeable about the reroute but it was rejected because of cost? To date, no government representative has made public ANY DETAILED COST ANALYSIS OF THE REROUTE. If the current CDOT plan is to gain acceptance of the community, it MUST BE PROVED BETTER THAN THE ALTERNATE ROUTE. Please show us, in a minimum number of charts that are properly labeled, what factors were used in the comparison and who made the final decision to disregard the reroute.

The current CDOT plan for I-70 has been under development since 2008. Please explain why so many CURRENT design decisions are made in reaction to new community concerns. Why is there still no SINGLE plan recommended by CDOT? How are we supposed to make specific comments about the SEIS when so many variables are still under discussion, e.g., access lanes on one or both sides. One cap or two caps? Why no cap forced ventilation? What happens in a stop and crawl traffic jam?

I am concerned about the way this project is transpiring in an area that is already underserved. There needs to be significant infrastructure (wide, sweeping sidewalks; open green spaces; public art; improved libraries and recreation centers) built into the plan to expand I-70. It is not fair to continue to dump pollutants on the Elyria-Swansea and Globeville neighborhoods without putting back in some public spaces. Their space is being used for the good of the public (transportation) so they should receive just public spaces in return. The plans for expansion need to mitigate the air and other pollution. There are designs that would help with this. Please address them.

AS a long time resident ( before the original I-70 ) I believe the I-70 monster can not be stopped and as I am sorry to lose more and more of our little neighborhood, the channel would be the best option to go with. It would be a straight shot east to west and visa versa, BUT I am angry that C DOT is so blind as to think that a park over I-70 at a cost of more than \$150 million is a graet idea. not only do we already have a park 2 blocks north, and another park 2 blocks south, THIS bridge will replace the accident prone Stapleton airport bridges which crossed I-70 between Quebec St. and Havana St. more and more accidents and deaths under there until they had to be demolished for safety sake.... I believe the money and concrete wasted on this PARK could be better used to connect every street north and south thru this corridor. A NEW 2 or 3 story school that can be built 2 blocks south @ 4400 Columbine a FULL city block owned free and clear by the City & County of Denver, @ a cost of only ONE & 1/2 million dollars would not only be far enough away that it would be 200% less polution than keeping a ageing school that would need over 1 million dollars plus a PARK to help mitigate the over wellmming pollution problems. If you think our neighborhood needs a NEW PARK build a new school elsewhere and you can build a PARK where the old school was. Please keep 46th ave a staight shot next to I-70 between Colo. Blvd. & Brighton Blvd. as to keep that over flow or accident avoiding traffic next to I-70. If you want to run an access road thru Swansea & Elyria use 48th ave, as it goes straight from Colo. Blvd. to 1 block away from the new light rail station to be built at 49th and Brighton Blvd. ( even thru Eaton Metal's yard ) and this won't split our neighborhoods in 1/2 again. I believe this Park is a way to show the nation how forward thinking Denver is, but it will only prove how backwards we are. I only hope that all the supporters of this new PARK will have their names on it so that everyone will know who is responsible for their loved ones injury or death under this PARK, and all the health problems, and accidents the kids going to the old school 1/2 a block away WILL expereince. Build it right and build it for 2100 not for 2002 GOOD LUCK Swansea, Elyria, Denver

To whom it may concern; I would like to take this opportunity to voice my concern over the I-70 expansion. I don't understand how this project can be advocated by anyone, except the Australian company who will build it. Coming from California I have seen expanded freeways fail miserably time and time again. Part of the reason I moved here was to escape the traffic. I think Denver is a unique place, and I hope a better solution can be found, rather than expanded highways. I think this is a huge waste of money, and will only benefit those who pay the tolls. The neighborhoods of the northeast will be negatively affected, and I urge you to re-consider this idea. Thank you for your consideration

There is a rumor floating around that Denver City/County will get \$250 Million to spend as it pleases. Is there any basis of truth to this rumor? Is there some number other than \$250 Million? If so, what are the facts? Where will the money come from and how will it be allocated?

I am strongly opposed to the current plans for the I-70 expansion to the east of I-25. I am a Realtor who works in many of the neighborhoods that would be impacted by the expansion and also am a frequent traveler on I-70 from Sheridan to Colorado. From a Real Estate standpoint, I believe adding this large of highway to the already struggling neighborhoods east of I-25 would literally kill these neighborhoods and make it near impossible for them to ever recover. These are homes owned by people who can't afford to have values decreased by 5-10% and it would be a major injustice to many homeowners who have been there for years. I travel almost everyday west on I-70 at 5 pm. Traffic is already terrible trying to merge from I-25 to I-70 west bound. I can't imagine how much worse it will be when there are twice as many lanes trying to merge and if how traffic flows as bad as it does from Santa Fe to I-25 northbound, I have little hope in using I-70 in the future. I feel overall it is a bad plan with much better alternatives out there that could transform the city for the better instead of being a continued armpit of the city with traffic as bad or worse than I-25

It is time to build the new I 70 along the route proposed by CDOT. The alternatives have been studied endlessly for more than 10 years and CDOT has identified the best route. Please get it built and quit wasting more \$\$ on more studies.

I am forwarding the attached document to be included in the SDEIS public comment process. Its likely that I am among many submitting it or referencing it. I am not the author of it, I did not participate in the peer review, nor do I even fully-understand the context and all of the concerns that are contained within it, but, I do see that the authors have incredible experience as urban planners and they are making incredibly-strong supporting arguments for many points that I have made in the comments I submitted this week. Those topics include, but are not limited to:

- \* Forecasting models are incorrect & flawed
- \* Data for traffic projection is flawed
- \* Project area boundaries are incorrect
- \* Study of tandem facilities is incorrect (not a system-wide approach)
- \* Community outreach is not good
- \* The order is incorrect as it relates to neighborhood plans should precede the I-70 planning so they can be planned in conjunction
- \* Alternative forms of transit, such as commuter rail and bicycling is not factored-in properly
- \* The social justice issue and architectural preservation aspects of the neighborhoods is not fairly represented
- \* Many more topics

Will the discussion of what is contained in this paper finally cause CDOT to stop, press the reset button, and look at this from the 10,000 foot perspective [look at the whole north metro system, look at today's trends, use today's leading models, use data that is accurate and appropriate, work to deliver phenomenal projects the way RTD does? It should be noted that on several occasions, a similar type of review was proposed by the AIA [R/UDAT team] via the work Dean Foreman has offered to do a review of the project. That was rejected/prevented by CDOT. Another attempt, by John Prosser, made an attempt to engage the internationally-respected Urban Land Institute's Advisory Services Panel to do a review and that too was rejected by CDOT. Why would CDOT not allow such help? Some of the people working on these projects are literally among the best in the world.

Regarding safety: Potential freeway flooding is a big concern. In the past 18 months, we've experienced unprecedented flooding in the Denver metro area. Many other areas are having similar problems, Phoenix is a perfect example, where they have had repeated freeway flooding in the past few months and loss of life from people drowning in their cars on the freeway. A gravity-fed drainage system with such a small grade to it is going to clog with sediment. Its not steep enough. Sand. Gravel. Car parts. Debris flying off of & out of trucks. Tire chunks. Trash that blows-in from the kids playing on top of the freeway. Blowing leaves. And, much more will all clog this system. For the first few months, when the tubes are not clogged, the water will flow down to pumps that simply won't be able to keep up in heavy rainfall. Maintenance on the pumps will be significant. What does copious amounts of Mag Chloride do to the pumps? Does the Platte River mind getting incredible amounts of de-icing agent? What is the annual projected costs for drainage system maintenance? What amount of chemical de-icing will be necessary? How does this compare to an at-grade freeway that has sunlight on it? Lets build a project that has maintenance costs similar to a Toyota, rather than building one that will be like maintaining a '60s MG as a daily driver. The trench will be like an MG in my car analogy here. Thank you for listening

As highlighted and discussed in the I-70 East Reconstruction – Denver, Colorado Transportation Planning Division Peer Review & White Paper from the American Planning Association dated October 14, 2014, the lack of comprehensive system wide planning and near absolute avoidance of community planning seems to be a major oversight of CDOT and the other communities and agencies that support the current preferred alternative. In my professional opinion, if this “trench” is constructed we will be stuck with it, and the disconnects, environmental impacts and community isolation it creates for the next several generations or longer.

I understand that CDOT is the lead agency, and their mission as defined on their website is To provide the best multi-modal transportation system for Colorado that most effectively and safely moves people, goods, and information. But as stated in the White Paper noted above and from my observations and involvement in the project planning process, it appears the purpose and need of the I-70 East project is short sighted and narrow in focus. By this I mean it considers the importance of the I-70 infrastructure but only as a means of moving traffic and not on it's role or impacts on and in the neighborhoods and communities it bisects and bypasses.

In an effort to ensure that the current preferred alternative is the best solution for a larger majority of interested parties, would CDOT be willing to delay the release of the Final EIS until the City has approved and adopted various planning documents for communities, corridors and facilities within the I-70 East project area? These planning efforts include, but aren't limited to, the Globeville Neighborhood Plan, Elyria Swansea Neighborhood Plan, National Western Stock Show Station Area Plan, National Western Center, Brighton Blvd Corridor Redevelopment, River North (RiNo) and various RTD Station Development plans. By delaying the release of the Final EIS, CDOT and other regulating agencies such as the City and County of Denver and DRCOG could ensure that the selected preferred alternative is a solution that sets the foundation for a strong future by defining land use, economic strategies, and development solutions that compliment and support the interstate freeway, regional and community infrastructures equally.



1 Closing Swansea Elementary and rebuilding it elsewhere is only appropriate, given that the children will be exposed to serious levels of pollution/contaminants/noise, etc. 2 Children's asthma levels are already high in Elyris Swansea and Globeville. Living for 6 years (or more) on top of a highway is unacceptable. 3 Why is there no mention of PM2.5 in the SDEIS? Where are the reports of this serious contaminant, the recorded levels, and the destructive nature of this dangerous particulate? This is not an omission, this is intentional malfeasance. 4 Re: Gravity fed drainage. I have read the hydrology report and listened to CDOT's hydrology experts and I am utterly unconvinced the plan to move snow and ice (let alone the free/flowing water) up hill (from 40'™ below grade to grade level, over 1.5 miles of pipe (I believe that's the distance), with 2-90 degree angles, in to a massive holding tank, will work. a. To begin with, having no plan for pumps is insupportable. (as is the plan for no full-time fans under the cap(s), but I digress). b. Denver has had 3-6 100 year floods since 1948. That all of CDOT's estimates are built on the 100 year model, and only 1 hours' worth of rain is also breathtakingly naive. Last year's rains were the 1000 year rain and would have killed everyone who was trapped in their car on the highway. c. Taking the 100 yr. flood and the 1 hour very heavy rainfall factors into account, the sheer fact that CDOT proposes to build this superstructure directly on top of a significant water table discounts the fact that with a water table so close to the surface as it is, there is simply nowhere for the water to go as the ground saturates more quickly hence the history of frequent flooding in the area. d. This rate of flow of the floodwaters makes the holding tank areas (quite a distance away from the highway, I might add,) even less feasible past the 1 hour threshold. e. This water will be remarkably contaminated, particularly during construction due to the release of all the poisonous contaminants. i. What is the rate of acceptable water capture diversion to the water tanks for decontamination? ii. Once the 1 hour, or surpassed volume of rain, is breached, where will the water be held before it backs up? iii. Once the water treatment holding tanks are breached, where does the contaminated water go? iv. What contaminants are of the highest concern? v. How will the community be notified? Does that contact come from CPHE once they are notified by CDOT? f. What is the plan for capture and remediation of contaminants that are released into flood waters? g. Who is responsible for the remediation? h. Who is responsible for the cleanup?

Connectivity - I am concerned about the crossings/exits at York, Vasquez, and Colorado. If this project is meant to benefit then these neighborhood connections must be preserved, especially given the footprint of the project. Furthermore, biking and pedestrian safe crossings and separated infrastructure are super important.

Please reconsider then needs for 10 lanes. The APA independent review found flaws in the modeling used to determine traffic counts.

Please move forward with the lowered, covered I-70 alternative. It will re-connect the neighborhood and move the eye-sore viaduct out of sight. The re-route option is now a mute point, having been discussed years ago & ruled out. After all the discussions are concluded & the dust settles, CDOT simply needs to begin reconstruction and move forward!

There is a lot of traffic going to I-70 from that ramp from York St. Most of that traffic is from Josephine. Since that ramp is going away the traffic will be heading for the Brighton Blvd. ramp along with other 46th Ave traffic. I am sure there will be a stoplight at 46th & Brighton causing congestion. So build a ramp from 46th to I-70 west bound right before you get to Brighton. Looks like the ramp would be downhill to I-70. Or maybe build a ramp from 46th over Brighton Blvd. to the Brighton ramp to I-70 west bound avoiding the Brighton/46th interchange.

Emergency vehicle access before during & after the construction is a major concern of the communities, north and south of existing structure. Drainage of the lanes is also a concern. What is plan for re-route of traffic is it through neighborhoods or will we that live in area have to drive miles around, just to get home?

CDOT needs to listen to the people of the community that this affects.

I don't know who you talk to - and when who want this project - the cover - community gardens, I don't know anyone I talk to who has major support. As for Swansea School - parents who think it's a good idea do not own a home - just rent - and move overnight. No homeowner who has owned a home 30 or more years agree with any of what you want to do to our neighborhood. Widening 46th Ave Clayton. CDOT you will be in my living room. Thanks a lot

My husband and I live in Montbello and will be impacted by the expansion of the I-70 lanes with air quality concerns, hazardous materials, noise, truck traffic, flooding and crash recovery. The construction of the tunnel and deep trench will create contaminated soil and dust particles into the air which will add to the front range ground level ozone levels. Poor air quality will greatly impact people's health in the neighborhoods east of I-25. Driving conditions will be a nightmare during and after heavy rains which will create flooding and crash recover issues; also in winter cold and snow with icing. The option of moving the freeway onto I-76 & I-270 routes and converting the existing route to a six-lane tree-lined boulevard needs to be studied. This will give the commuters the ability to get to their destinations without the adding to the air pollution in the adjacent neighborhoods. This option is a win for the neighborhoods creating less traffic air pollution, less noise & less health impacts for the communities. It also is a win for Denver by improving the entrance into our city with a tree-lined boulevard creating less noise, congestion and emission pollution. This option will help keep our city cleaner and give a great impression for travelers and businesses visiting Denver. Please study this option. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the SDEIS and the alternative to re-route I-70 and convert the existing route to a tree-lined boulevard.

I'm calling to express my extreme concern about the proposed widening of I-70 between Pena and I-25. I have read the I-70 East Environmental Impact Statement Supplemental Draft. I have attended the Denver City Club meeting at the Brown Palace and have listened to different opinions about this. I'm extremely concerned about the proposal to acquire 23 businesses and 51 homes or 56 homes, whatever the number will be, to allow expansion of this. I know I have heard that it is only 21 businesses and 53 or 56 homes, however many it is. But if one considers the number of people involved in taking the businesses and home, even providing what is supposed to be adequate compensation, one must consider the disruption in the lives of these people. If they have businesses, where will they relocate their businesses since their clientele attend those businesses. Where will they find places to relocate these businesses that they can afford compared to what they are paying now? Please consider the people that you are moving. Some may involve disruption of families. Certainly it'll be disruption of neighborhoods. Where will these people find housing that is affordable as what they are now living in? I think this is, from a social standpoint, extremely disruptive to the lives of these people. I think one could consider different options and I have read the options that have been proposed by CDOT. I think that those options could be considered, especially the loop option to use I-76 and 270, since the need to widen these roads would not involve moving nearly the number of businesses and probably hardly any homes and I don't think this would disrupt traffic at all for those people who want to use I-25 coming south. I certainly would be willing to drive an extra 2 miles and not disrupt the homes and businesses that you are proposing. I would also say that the managed lanes or toll lanes you are proposing will not be used as much as you think. Studies have shown that people who make less than \$75,000 a year simply don't use those lanes and I would believe that most people would simply put up with a little extra time, rather than pay the monies that are proposed to have to be paid to use these tolls lanes. I would strongly oppose widening I-70 and would strongly recommend using an option, such as the loop option. Thank you very much for listening.

I was just trying to leave a comment on the I-70 project that is going to be coming up on hand. There is a couple of things, you know, the underground or the recess, I think that's what they called it, is just such a more expensive project than building a new viaduct besides the fact that it's going to impact the community harder and longer on this period. So, I was hoping that, you know, if you could talk to me a little bit and maybe help me understand what the underground versus the viaduct is. As of now, me, myself, and a couple of other people would prefer the viaduct or the alternative route to be looked at because the recessed area or the underground I-70 is just going to be too wide. It's going to affect too many people and the construction is going to be way, way too long and the community is going to basically be torn apart through the construction period of time and also with a brand new hole in the middle of Swansea and Globeville too. Elyria kind of sits off to the side, but if anybody would like to call me, that's perfectly fine. If not, I would really like for my comments to taken into account and into consideration for any of the open processing, commenting period. Thank you very much. You guys have a wonderful day.

I am concerned about the new construction. I think, actually, it is a great idea and something needs to be done about that elevated portion. However, before that project takes place, I feel that 270 has been neglected for many, many years and there was a construction improvement there probably 10/12 years ago that never really got completed. It was widened, but it never was completed from Vasquez to Quebec in both directions. So however I believe that that should be corrected and widen 270 to accommodate the majority of the traffic that is going to be diverted from the I-70 project. So that is my big concern. 270 is antiquated and needs to be updated now so the traffic that comes and uses that road so when this construction starts in a couple of years it is going to be overwhelming with that section of 270. So please call me back and let me know what's your feelings with that.

I think CDOT's proposal is a horrible idea, because there's a possibility of flooding under those viaducts. We even had that out at the old Stapleton airfield when it was flooding under the bridge and I agree with the Unite North Metro plan, which is to route I-70 between Wadsworth and Central Park Boulevard north to 270 and I-76. I certainly hope we don't go through with I-70's plan and build that park area, 4-acre park area. We'll have a probability of accidents, even though it'll be widened. There is also flooding that occurs when there is an unusual rain pattern. Thank you. I hope you give this justifiable consideration and you consider the logistics. Bye bye.

Hi, I live in Park Hill. This is regarding the I-70 expansion project. I agree with Dennis Gallagher and his counterpoint in the Greater Park Hills News. This is a boondoggle. It's the wrong time to do such an expansion. It will be a disaster for northern Denver, not only due to pollution and impact, but also this is a time we need to encourage alternative transportation. A fraction of that amount could be spent for sidewalks, bike paths, encouragement of electric vehicles, and nonpolluting forms of transportation. As Atlanta, Dallas, Los Angeles have proven time and time again, traffic cannot be out built. Putting in 10 lanes is a boondoggle. It is the wrong thing for Denver. It'll be an environmental and impactful disaster for northern Denver. This expansion needs to be stopped and a much more logical and smaller improvement to I-70 should be done. Thank you.

Hello. I am just calling because I am a person who is definitely for rerouting the interstate from Wadsworth and I-70 around 270 and the I-76 corridor and definitely against the lowering of the road through the central neighborhood. Most cities have major traffic routed around the city and then your boulevards within the city for the neighborhoods. I think the option of lowering the interstate would still cause tremendous problems for both of those communities. Thanks, bye.

I'm just leaving a comment regarding the I-70 East Environmental Impact Statement. I just want to throw my support behind it. I think it is an awesome idea. I think rebuilding I-70 is what we need to really improve vehicular access throughout the region. I think adding a park is a great idea to try to help bring those two neighborhoods back together again. We don't have enough highways as it is, so it's great that we are looking at actually improving the ones that we do and bringing them up to 2014 standards. Again, I support the draft EIS and I hope to see construction start in 2016.

Yeah, you don't have to call me back, but I'm just reading your brochure about your I-70 project that you're proposing and I gotta tell you, it's really stupid to think about putting that big park over the interstate. If you remember the old Stapleton airway tunnels, they always slowed down traffic during bad weather especially and a police officer, at least one that I remember, was killed in those tunnels. So it's stupid to think about making more tunnels and that's my comment. Have a great day. Bye.

I am just calling to express my support for your plan. I also think you should consider a multimodal concept for the whole corridor and to my mind that means an interstate bus system. Thanks for taking my comment.

<p>I have attended many meetings and listened to both CDOT and the folks that are proposing the I76 reroute. I think the reroute proposal makes the most sense for several reasons, and I really wish CDOT would give it more consideration. It sure seems like they have their mind made up and they will consider nothing but the current plan. What struck me as a cogent point was that this is Denver's one chance to change the traffic landscape of the city. Getting rid of an ugly interstate like I70 can't be a bad thing; return all of that urban area to the people who live there. Let's not waste this one opportunity to make the highways work for us. I76 is There, and I understand CDOT plans to widen it and work on it anyway. What perfect time to just make it the new I70. DOING SO WOULD RESULT IN MUCH, MUCH LESS TRAFFIC AND CONGESTION DURING THE MULTI YEAR CONSTRUCTION PROCESS. The widening will just "push the train wreck down the track" as the jam up will be tremendous at I 25 and to the east when all of those lanes merge down. All I ask is that the reroute project be given serious consideration, not the lip service dismissal that it has been given to this point. Sure it will be more complicated to do the reroute project because then plans will have to be developed for the current I 70 Corridor. But there are a lot of smart folks out there who would jump at the opportunity to help figure out how to redevelop that entire area and make it an area we can be proud of.</p>
<p>No Eminent Domain.</p>
<p>I-70 would benefit with more traffic lanes.</p>
<p>I-70 would benefit with more traffic</p>
<p>It will really affect the environment and third parties and we would not like it to happen, but the best will be for everything to be resolved the best way</p>
<p>I would support a plan that allows current business infrastructure the same ease in future as now - meaning that any replacement should meet or exceed current demand. A world class city has these problems, we all adjust to them or move to smaller towns...</p>
<p>The proposed project appears to present a significant health and environmental risk to the residents of the Elyria-Swansea/Globeville neighborhoods. I strongly urge extensive study of these risks and modification of the project based on the results.</p>
<p>After close study of the project as it now stands, and review of alternatives which seem to be off the table, I am concerned that the proposed project, which is theoretically supposed to allow the Globeville/Swansea area to feel more connected, will fail in this regard, and further separate the neighborhood. It seems that concerns about re-routing I-70 north, over to the C-270 and I-76 area may be overstated. There has been significant growth north of Denver, and putting I-70 further north (perhaps along the I-76 alignment at Wadsworth, then back to 270) would provide better access to both east and west traffic flow, and lessen traffic through the mousetrap at I-25/I-76. It seems that you could leave the current I-70 from Wadsworth to Quebec, as it is, and eventually turn it back into a lower speed limit cross town main thoroughfare, like Colfax, or Hampden, or County Line. I think the cost to build the much wider I-70 could be better spend with a re-route north, which would allow better long term plans for the current I-70.</p>
<p>*Air Quality: My brother was sick with asthma and suffered all his childhood. The dust can bring his asthma back. On my part, I have always been sick with my nose, with sinusitis and dust allergies. When you move all this, there will be a lot of dust in the air that my brother and myself will be breathing. The air has to be one of the most important things you should be focusing on when moving the soil that will be moved.</p> <p>*Noise: My address is 4 houses from the bridge. The noise is going to be high from the machines and the demolition. You also need to make sure that the noise is not very high, our home would be the first one on the street once everything is changed. The noise for 4 years and the dust in the air for so long is not going to be good for our health.</p>
<p>Moving the project to I-76 makes more sense than the present one. We would vote for this solution. Why create more of a problem when the problem could be solved much easier.</p>
<p>Totally Irresponsible to increase air pollution, destroy properties, promote negative health consequences to adults and children. A total disregard for the area's welfare by expanding traffic lanes for profit and spending 1.3 billion for 11/2 miles of highway is "highway robbery"! This area has suffered enough!</p>
<p>This issue should come to a more public review. It is objectionable for the reasons I have circled. As a doctor, the air quality impact disturbs me most; there must be better alternatives to this.</p>

I-70 expansion is a bad idea. When you consider the imminent collapse of our civilization due to climate change, resource depletion, collapse of ecosystems, imminent collapse of unsustainable economies, the hostile takeover of our government by moneyed interests, etc., the plans to expand I-70 are an extreme misallocation of resources at a pivotal time in human history. Rather than continue down the foredoomed path of fossil fuel consumption, let's spend our dwindling resources on more positive, helpful projects, such as mass transportation and renewable energy. It's not impossible. Other countries are doing it. If we could somehow manage the trick of becoming self-sustaining, we would have the added benefit of feeling less compelled to conduct war in oil-rich parts of the world. Other bad consequences for our community will be further decimation of our neighborhoods, increased smog and noise, deflation of nearby property values, shipping of hazardous waste through neighborhoods. The image of Easter Islanders persisting in carving giant statues up to the moment that they couldn't do it anymore comes to mind. They did this in the face of resource depletion to which they seemed to be oblivious, until it was too late.

The meeting I attended in September brought up some interesting facts. 1. Home ownership is 6170 along the proposed corridor, the majority being Latino. 2. The average life span of residents in the affected neighborhoods is less than 5 + years than the city average, pollution along the I-70 corridor contributing to that. 3. The proposed lowering of I-70 with a cover would take 100% of the state's bridge money for at least 10 years. 4. CDOT does not budget for parks, as is proposed for the cover. 5. Expanding I-70 to make more lanes along the current corridor would take more homes and some businesses. 6. Construction on the proposed plan would contribute even more pollution to the neighborhood and is suggesting closing the elementary school during the construction phase. That does not contribute to the integrity of the neighborhood. If the city really wants to improve and integrate the neighborhood, CDOT needs to seriously look at the proposed plan to route I-70 north via I-270 & I-76 for the following reasons. 1. CDOT owns the land for expanding the number of lanes on I-270 & I-76. 2. There are much less residential homes and neighborhoods along this stretch. It is either barren or commercial. 3. Light rail will be going near the current I-70 corridor as it goes past the National Western Complex. 4. Studies suggest that personal traffic will decrease as mass transit continues to expand. 5. A boulevard where the current I-70 is now would be much more aesthetic and a bringing of the Globeville - Swansea neighborhood together. More cross streets would pull the neighborhood together. 6. Truck traffic that contributes to the majority of the pollution would be pulled away from the city improving the air quality. 7. The proposed lowering of I-70 and widening it could result in multiple lawsuits and could delay any project for a decade or better. Most major cities now have a beltway around the city to allow thru traffic to avoid local congestion. Make I-270 & I-76 a part of the northern diversion.

I have several homes in the area and I don't want the highway in these neighborhoods. Take the highway out and studied the I-76 -270 highway alternative.

Look at rerouting I-70 to 270.

Something else needs to be done that doesn't effect the residents of that community.

The displacement of all those homes and the expense of digging the tunnel. It would be cheaper to widen I-76 and combine the two from bringing Blvd. to out where it connects into I-70 and still unite the neighborhood. We united again improve Air quality and another street to carry some traffic.

Noise - If the elevated is slightly high I understand the noise will be less. Also the particles will partly evaporate with the wind. School - You should move the school. At one part meeting, CDOT promised to help build a school and combined Recreation center. Would work out fine now. Recessed - No recessed road, no toll lanes. No toll road. Either rebuild I-70 and steer the truck traffic to I-270 or make 46th Avenue a Boulevard and switch truck traffic to I-270. Roads - Roads and roads and recessed to destroy our historic neighborhood. We don't need that.

You are ruining our neighborhood forever and you don't care. What happened to your promise, "We will do what is right for the neighborhood," remember? Comments: Do not close off York Street at 46th Josephine St. is not a through street I heard in the future. This was one story. Please do not put a toll road through the city of Elyria and Swansea. Cities inside a city do not need a toll road. That will cut us down to 8 lanes which is more than enough. But that would even us up with I-70 between mouse trap and Brighton Blvd. And if you decide to make it really right - just widen 270 and I-76 that will make our area a perfect city again. But if you can see the 46th avenue as a boulevard, that would be perfect.

If you don't get the option for 270 - I-76. Here is a solution to your problem. All you have to do is to rebuild our I-70 viaduct to 8 lanes, which is a little wider but much more attractive and leave 46th Avenue as is. You are painting yourself into a corner with your closing York Street. You are putting roads full of trucks and cars through especially the Swansea neighborhood. You are destroying more homes along York Street and completely mystifying how to get to the Denver History Museum. Leave York alone. Why do you (CDOT) have to feel you have to have roads tearing up the neighborhood to make (in your word) togetherness and much too difficult to understand. You say beautify - I say destroy. Can't you leave it just like it is now (only wider). It has been a beautiful neighborhood before you started your new modern ideas.

I have great concerns about closing the exit at York St. That is such a main way of getting to several of Denver's favorite attractions. I don't think this has been thought through.

This proposal will be an environmental disaster and an abuse of public taxes. Go back to the drawing board. Listen to experts outside of CDOT. The toll lanes are simply rude. My children do not own cars and never want to. You are not looking at the realities of future generations. Postpone your deadline and start listening to others.

The displacement of innocent people disturbs me the most. A reroute will return the neighborhood to its former glory. Your plan serves the communities. You need to reroute the traffic of trucks and cars that are passing through north to restore a fair quality of life to the deserving people that live in the shadows of I-70.

To Whom It May Concern:

I Sylvia E. Valdez am writing this letter to give my opinion and express some very important concerns regarding the new proposal for I-70 East. I am a local business owner for 38 years now. I've been very active in the community and have had some disturbing things happen but this here is a big deal and takes the cake! We have much more pressing issues and more important things to work on. Some things cannot be ignored any longer. For instance we already have a problem with our homeless community, number 1, them being homeless and number 2, that our homeless are using underneath our existing bridge to sleep and live. There are many things I can think of where taxpayers money would be more wisely invested. Why not put the money into a new school, larger and AWAY from the highway? How about a homeless shelter to help our community, this is something that is much needed and desired by ALL community members, not just our homeless families. I've been a resident in the Swansea/Elyria area for over 70 years now and would love to a "proud" resident but it is challenging to do so when you are living next to or under the highway, where it's been destroyed by this existing highway which has created a tremendous amount of disgusting air pollution. Our neighborhood was at once a nice place to call home and now we are faced with pollution everyday and not to mention all the waste and garbage that is thrown from the highway onto our front porch, forcing our already sickened children to play in an unhealthy and dirty environment created by the pollution from the highway, let our neighborhood rest some, we've taken all of the unwanted noise long enough, the railroad, the highway and Purina are all prime examples of some of the noise and pollution we deal with on the daily, the pollution itself has been striking up illnesses and sicknesses in our residents for many years now. Some long time residents have really suffered long term affects but thats just some of the negative things.

A bad idea! It will bottleneck at mousetrap. Pollutes the air to close to schools. Widening 76 is mucher better idea.

Recommend reroute. I think 70 is used primarily by through traffic. Proposed lowering/widening will disrupt & damage neighborhoods. Will cause widening of 70 west of 25 & damage to those neighborhoods as well. Will lessen neighborhoods access to each other. New highway will attract development of lofts & multifamily development & drive out single family housing, changing the neighborhood. There's no place for those families to go.