

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

Comment #	Contact	City	Zip	Date	Comment type	Comment
1.	Lynn Cirbo	Denver	80229	4/1/09	Written Comment- Public Meeting	Concern regarding the Combined Alternative: Closure of Broadway access from I-25. Our business is located at 70th and Washington. We run service trucks all along the Front Range, Cheyenne to Pueblo. We live in Brighton and our employees live up North. We use this exit on a daily basis. We see a need for a new ramp from I-25 to HWY 36, but also see a need for local access to Broadway for residents and businesses. Within a 1 mile radius of Broadway and 36 there are 571 Businesses! We ask you to consider an exit to Broadway be included in your plans for this busy industrial area. Have you researched the economic impact to the area businesses? Have you researched the loss of revenue to Adams County? Have you considered the loss of property values? Have you considered emergency response impact? have you considered additional traffic congestion at Pecos St. and through many school zones?
2.	Ken Katt	Aurora	80014	4/1/09	Public meeting- written comment	The "crossover effect" as vehicles access the egress from the HOT lanes will impose detrimentally on those in the General Purpose lanes and increase the number of accidents. Go to a straight BRT (no HOV or HOT) or make all lanes General Purpose (and free) which is what C-470 and I-225 elected officials have determined is best.

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

3.	Ken Katt	S.E. Denver	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined Alt – “unworkable” [Concern was expressed that the Combined Alternative, especially a buffer separated managed lane, is ‘unworkable’ and presents various safety concerns] • MGD Lane Access [Concern was expressed over the design for a buffer separated managed lane and how accessing and exiting it could be of concern for safety of those traveling in the general purpose lanes] • Exiting and Entering • Testimonies – Regional [This individual cited various testimonies from regional officials expressing concern with a buffer separated managed lane, but not directly referencing the US 36 project] • Safety Issues [Concern was expressed for the safety of those traveling in general purpose lanes due to traffic that would weave through those lanes to access, or exit from, the median managed lane] • Footprint Dimensions [The dimensions of the project footprint were brought into question, as it related to the width of lanes and shoulders] • Total footprint 41 ft.
----	----------	-------------	-----	--------	---------------------------------------	---

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I-25 BRT Guide way [An example was provided about the managed lane design on I-25 and suggestions how the US 36 managed lane could be designed] • Bi Directional • 8 ft. shoulders • Weaving – MGD Lane to GP Lane [Concern was expressed for the safety of those traveling in general purpose lanes due to traffic that would weave through those lanes to access, or exit from, the median managed lane]
4.	Cheryl Peniston	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition Re: Project Scheduling and Impacts [A request was made to provide the public with more information regarding the project schedule and especially to inform those facing property impacts] • Real-estate Decision Making [A concern was expressed for informing the public of the project schedule so that people could make informed decisions about their properties along US 36] • Broadway Access [Concern was expressed about how eliminating access to Broadway from US 36 could impact the local community, businesses and

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<p style="color: red;">residents in that area]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to Community • Business • Residential
5.	Bill Christopher	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address Economic Stimulus \$ [A request was made to inform those at the meeting about how federal funding through the economic stimulus package was being applied in the US 36 corridor]
6.	Paul	Broomfield	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$ Impacts [An explanation was requested to determine if communities would be facing financial impacts by funding US 36 improvements] • Decision making to allocate \$\$ for corridor [How is decision making being made to allocate the funding which is available for corridor transportation improvements as they relate to the US 36 corridor as a whole] • Is funding available? [Is the funding available to implement the proposed US 36 improvements]
7.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why not open all lanes to all users? [It was questioned if the managed lane was necessary and why all lanes would not be open to all users]

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why have a HOV/HOT lane? [The need for a HOV/HOT lane was questioned] • RTD/Bus [Providing an exclusive lane for RTD and BRT service was questioned] • All general purpose lanes [Support was expressed for making all lanes general purpose]
8.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bike path- at grade crossing? • 72nd Ave. [Will the bikeway crossing at 72nd Ave be an at-grade crossing?]
9.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bike traffic on Bradburn • Accommodations? [What will be done to accommodate bike traffic along Bradburn Blvd as proposed by the Us 36 Bikeway]
10.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will you charge one person in managed lane? • Transponder – how does it work?
11.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A study of impacts on business owners? [Has a study been conducted to determine the impacts that would occur to businesses if access to Broadway were to be eliminated?] • Esp. Broadway access

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

12.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiscal Impacts [What are the fiscal impacts of the Combined Alternative, how much will it cost?]
13.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footprint reduced [Support was expressed for having reduced the overall project footprint]
14.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phased approach [Could you please explain what can be expected by the phased approach of implementing improvements as described?]
15.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Money/Funding – RTD? CDOT? Cities and Counties? [Where is the funding for this project coming from? Is it being provided by CDOT, RTD, or the local communities?]
16.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/1/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where does single occupancy fee go? [What will be done with the revenue collected from tolling?] Who manages? [Who will manage the toll lane and how will it be enforced?] How?
17.	Keith Dameron	Denver	80202	4/1/09	Email Comment	I like the combined alternative overall. The concept of phasing the work as funds are available is very wise and should be

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						considered in other FasTracks corridors too! Thank you for working to involve the respective government agencies, cities and counties in the process! Reducing the cost from 2.4 Billion to 1.9 Billion is commendable! I hope that the NW rail is started soon with a phased approach too.
18.	Paula Young	Boulder	80303	4/6/09	Email Comment	Who schedules these meetings? The one in Boulder is on the first night of Passover. I guess you'll avoid having Jews there that way.
19.	Neal Lurie	Boulder	80304	4/8/09	Phone Call	Andrea Meneghel spoke to Neal about tonight's Public Meeting in Boulder. He informed Neal about next steps in the EIS schedule, how to provide comments, and what the outlook is for including the bikeway in Phase 1 improvements.
20.	Michael Rowe	Boulder	80304	4/8/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	In case no one noticed, during the recent snow storm that brought 15 inches of snow to Boulder, traffic, including busses was paralyzed on US36, while trains on the advances BNSF RR was moving normally. Why are we wasting money on BRT to expand a mode that is so weather dependent? Shift BRT money to a quick, complete build-out of the Northwest Rail commuter rail program.
21.	Anonymous			4/8/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	HOV users must not be required to have a transponder as a condition if using the managed lane!
22.	Anonymous			4/8/09	Public Meeting	Please include the Bikeway in Phase 1 and

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

					Written Comment	ensure that crossings are safe as it needs to be built as part of a connected network, both disjointed segments.
23.	Tim Rohrer	Boulder	80305	4/8/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I prefer to do nothing (package 1) because it is clear that the noise mitigation barrier that has been proposed can not adequately address the noise issue in Martin Acres from Table Mesa to Baseline Road. 1. Reduce the Speed Limit from Table Mesa to Baseline Road 2. Extend the noise barrier to Baseline Road. 3. Build the noise barrier before the other improvements happen as we already have a noise problem, I am deeply disappointed in the lack of political leadership on this issue (noise in Martin Acres) from the City of Boulder staff and council / Mayor's office. Once again Martin Acres is being sold out for the convenience of Central and North Boulder.
24.	Kevin McCarthy	Boulder	80303	4/8/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	None of the alternatives address flood abatement. Lower 47th street 15 feet - tell people to head east, not north and south.
25.	Maureen McCarthy	Boulder	80303	4/8/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Perhaps we should wait for any change on 36 till we can assess the effect that rail will have on moving population. Concerns that 100% of population living outside of Boulder and work here access the city by 36 - Foothills, 28th St. It seems some of the population shifts should happen prior to the major intersection of 36. 28th St and

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						Foothills highway. Make exits on 36 to 95th. Make bridge from South Boulder Road and extend McCaslin. (Don't think that will happen due to wealthier neighborhood).
26.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO2 because of increased buses [There was a concern expressed for increased levels of carbon emissions due to increased number of busses provided for US 36 BRT service] • Diesel bus concern [There was a concern for the use of diesel busses and support for seeking busses that could use alternative fuels] • Fixed guide way mass transit system on ballot [Support was expressed for allowing the public to vote for a fixed-guide way mass transit system on a future ballot]
27.	Mary Lee Zurick	Boulder	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise mitigation barrier & natural aesthetic [Support was expressed for providing noise mitigation treatment such as a sound wall which would incorporate natural features to have a pleasant aesthetic quality] <p>Exit on Table Mesa – safety [Support was expressed for increased safety measures to be</p>

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						considered for traffic at the Table Mesa Dr. exit]
28.	Mike R.	N/A	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost is twice that of commuter rail [The cost for the US 36 Combined Alternative package is double the cost of improving the Northwest Rail corridor] • Are funds going to the right resource? [Consideration should be given to make sure funding is being applied to the transportation alternative which will provide the greatest benefits to the corridor – US 36 or Northwest Rail]
29.	Linda	N/A	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity on trade-offs [This person asked for greater explanation be provided about the trade offs that have been made regarding elements of the Combined Alternative and how they compared to elements that were found in the DEIS packages – P2/P4 – such as a barrier separated managed lane versus a buffer separated managed lane, and median BRT stations versus side-loading BRT stations] <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buffer vs. barrier 2. Median vs. ramp

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

30.	Bill	N/A	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early phasing for bikeway [Support was expressed for inclusion of the bikeway in phase 1] • Include alternative fuel use [Support was expressed for the use of alternative fuel vehicles for US 36 BRT] • Auxiliary lanes & impact, cost An explanation was requested about the impacts and costs of proposed auxiliary lanes]
31.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity around division of U.S. 36 EIS & NWR EE [An explanation was requested about the separation of the US 36 and Northwest Rail studies, and definition about the how the two evaluations are different] • Alternative to cars? [A question was asked if there is an alternative to automobiles using US 36]
32.	Mayor Chuck Sisk	Louisville	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support improvements [The City of Louisville supports the improvements presented in the Combined Alternative package]

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives choices [The Combined Alternative provides the corridor with multi-modal transportation solutions] • Bikeway is important [Mayor Sisk supports the inclusion of the US 36 Bikeway in phase 1 improvements] • Noise mitigation in Louisville [Support was expressed for additional noise mitigation in segments of US 36 in Louisville]
33.	Neil Lurie	N/A	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include Bikeway [Neil expressed support for including the bikeway in phase 1 of improvements and to provide for safe, grade separated crossings at major intersections and interchanges without disrupting the overall connectivity of the bikeway] <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phase 1 2. Safe crossings 3. Overall connectivity
34.	K. McCarthy	Boulder	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impacts – Boulder Terminus [Concern was expressed about traffic]

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

					Discussion	<p style="color: red;">impacts (congestion) to local streets once traffic from US 36 reaches the Boulder terminus]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will traffic re-route before Boulder? – Exits before Boulder [An explanation was requested about how to mitigate for increased traffic at the Boulder terminus and it was asked how traffic would be re-routed at that location and if there would be other exists created east of Boulder to re-route traffic]
35.	Jim	Martin Acres	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise mitigation to Baseline – support [There was support expressed for extending noise walls all the way to Baseline Dr. and to do so immediately] • Speeds – noise [Support was expressed for lowering the speed limit to mitigate for noise impacts immediately]
36.	Tom Masterson	Martin Acres	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise mitigation – when? [An explanation was requested about when residents along the Table Mesa to Baseline section of US 36 could expect to see noise mitigations implemented]

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sooner – now [Support was expressed for immediate implementation of noise mitigations] 2. Extend to Baseline [Support was expressed for extending noise mitigations to Baseline Dr.] 3. Decrease speeds now [Support was expressed for the immediate reduction of speed limits to decrease noise impacts]
37.	Maureen	N/A	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic impacts [Concern was expressed for the impacts additional traffic from US 36 would have on local streets in Boulder at the Boulder terminus] 2. Boulder Terminus – alt. to go north [As an alternative to the Boulder terminus, it was suggested alternate routes could be created to divert traffic east of Boulder to reach northern points rather than have it go thru Boulder]

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality impacts – increase traffic [Concern was expressed about increased air quality impacts and the affect increased traffic would have on regional air quality]
38.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding – relationship to FasTracks [An explanation was requested about the relationship of RTD FasTracks funding to the US 36 EIS]
39.	Martha	City of Boulder	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City supports C.A. [The City of Boulder expressed support for the Combined Alternative] • Phase I BRT + Bikeway – support [The City of Boulder expressed support for the inclusion of BRT improvements and the US 36 bikeway in phase 1 improvements] • Noise mitigation [The City of Boulder stated it would continue to advocate for increased noise mitigation strategies] • Access to CU [The City of Boulder stated it would continue to advocate for maintaining access to the University of Colorado property along

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						Tantra Dr.]
40.	George Gerstle	Boulder County	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Combined Alternative [Boulder County expressed support for the Combined Alternative] • Support BRT + Managed Lane – moving people vs. cars [Boulder County expressed support for including full implementation of the managed lane and bikeway throughout the corridor to increase ‘people trips’ rather than ‘car trips’] • Importance of multi-modal choices [Boulder County emphasized the importance of supporting multi-modal transportation choices] • Inter-corridor mobility [Boulder County stated it would continue to advocate for the improved inter-corridor mobility solutions]
41.	Bob Brewster	N/A	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BRT operations – create efficiencies [Support was expressed to create an efficient BRT system] • Impacts to weaving [Concern was expressed for perceived hazards that

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<p>could occur due to weaving to and from the managed lane to access interchange exits]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus only lanes/road – east side of U.S. 36 [Support was expressed for a bus-only frontage road located on the east side of US 36]
42.	Dave Cook	N/A	N/A	4/8/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Bikeway – Phase I [Support was expressed for the inclusion of the bikeway in phase 1 improvements] • What’s in Phase I – when? [Clarification was requested about what is currently being considered for inclusion in phase 1 improvements and when those improvements could be expected] • Bus operations [Support was expressed for improved BRT service] <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Barrier vs. buffer? [An explanation was requested about the benefits and trade-offs of a buffer separated managed lane versus one that is barrier separated]

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						2. Median vs. side-loading stations [An explanation was requested about the benefits and trade-offs of a side-loading BRT stations versus median BRT stations]
43.	Laurel Andrews	Boulder	80303	4/8/09	Email Comment	Please consider noise abatement immediately for the corridor between Baseline Rd and Table Mesa Blvd. Reexamine the speed limit noise factor. I believe a 55 mph limit in this area would reduce noise significantly (but would require enforcement to happen. Include a noise wall/barrier in Phase 1 as the managed lanes are built or sooner since noise in already a problem.
44.	Jesse Kumin	Boulder	80304	4/8/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Waste of taxpayer money to have resources divided between two lousy ways of getting between Denver and Boulder. There should be one fast system that will get people out of their cars. Make one fast train, the Hong Kong Airport Express does the same trip (40 KM) 3 stops in 21 minutes. FasTracks is a fraud. It's a low choo-choo 30 MPH. Not a compelling alternative to cars. This project does nothing to get people out of their cars or reduce pollution.
45.	Marylee Zurick	Boulder	80303	4/8/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I'm concerned that noise mitigation between Table Mesa and Baseline will never Boulder happen or won't happen soon enough. Frasier Meadows has no protection from noise and the highway negatively impacting our quality

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						of life now. Along with a wall please add additional plants in from of the wall (facing the neighborhood) and protect the current plants. But before you build the wall, bring down the speed limit now between Baseline and Table Mesa please.
46.	Vanessa Grinestaff	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	The primary concern is the traffic flow through communities that would happen with the decrease of exits. That harms patrons crossing streets, children playing and animals roaming. The building process needs to look at the people first. The biggest improvement to the Broadway corridor is to maintain the build the bridge is severely diminishing and needs to be rebuilt - not CLOSED!! The committee is not thinking about the people, just the way to add more trouble on side streets. This exit is needed for those who want a quicker way home - not having to go around to other exits. The idea is mediocre and needs to think about reliable transportation. Keep the exit, build light rail and think about the people, kids, and animals this closing would affect!!
47.	Adam DuPont	Westwood College	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts – students [Concern was expressed for how the elimination of access to Broadway from US 36 could impacts students] • Access to campus [Support was expressed for maintaining access to

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<p style="color: red;">Broadway so that students would have direct access to campus]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency response [Support was expressed for maintaining access to Broadway so that emergency responders would have direct access to campus]
48.	Kathy Brown	Adams County	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.J. impacts [Concern was expressed that the community impacted was an environmental justice community and explanation was requested about what this classification meant and how it was being considered] • Discrimination [economic] [It was perceived that because this community was labeled as an environmental justice community that impacts were not being considered in the same manner as non-EJ communities and thus this community was being discriminated against because it was classified as low-income/minority]
49.	Spencer James	RTD Access-A-Ride	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays to Access-A-Ride schedules [Concern was expressed that if access to Broadway was eliminated then the RTD Access-a-Ride program would

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						be impacted]
50.	Ira	RTD (Retired)	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<p>[Concern was expressed for the safety of those traveling in the managed lanes due to the perception that those weaving to and from the managed lane, across general purpose lanes and going to or coming from interchanges, would create an unsafe situation. Concern was expressed for side-loading stations because it was perceived that busses traveling to and from these stations to the managed lane would increase the safety risk created by weaving patterns. Thus, support was expressed for median station to contain the BRT service and preventing it from mixing with general traffic]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety • Side loading stations • Supports median stations
51.	Dan Micek	Pearl Mack	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<p>[Concern was expressed for the number of properties impacted by the Combined Alternative package. It was requested that the project communicate closely with those impacted to inform them of the project schedule so that they could make the proper decisions relating to their properties]</p>

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property acquisition • Inform public of schedule
52.	Michelle	Denver	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to their building/business [tenants] [A concern was expressed for the impacts that the tenants at this individual's property would experience if access to Broadway were eliminated. Those impacts would then affect this person's business] • Process – background [Additional clarity was requested about the process that this project has went through to address the Broadway access issue and how it has informed and involved the public in the past]
53.	M.	N/A	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<p>[There will be significant impacts to the business of the gas station on Broadway, north of US 36, if access to Broadway is eliminated. Jobs will be lost and the business will suffer.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to business • Loss of jobs

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

54.	Cheryl Pinkston	N/A	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep/create jobs [Solutions to address the community which would be affected by eliminating access to Broadway should be focused on keeping the current levels of jobs in the community and creating more]
55.	Jim	N/A	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal C – Combined Alternative [Out of the options presented, support was expressed for Option C] • Additional ramp west of 75 [Support was expressed for the addition of an additional ramp west of 75th Street] • After 2035 → ramp closure [Clarification was requested that the access to Broadway would not take place until after 2035] • 72nd & Pecos → deadly intersection [It should be noted that the intersection of 72nd & Pecos is currently, very dangerous, and increasing the safety of this intersection should be taken into consideration as improvements to US 36 are being planned] • Impact of adding 4,000 cars to Pecos → safety & business impacts [If 4,000]

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<p style="color: red;">cars per day are added to the 72nd & Pecos intersection, there will be increased impacts to safety and businesses]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question – has this decision [to eliminate Broadway access] already been made? Does this meeting have an impact [on the decision making by CDOT/FHWA]?
56.	Johnson	N/A	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of bike paths: impacts of bike + car → safety, cost [Combining the use of bikeway along US 36 presents concerns about safety and including a bikeway seems as an unnecessary cost to the project]
57.	Norma Frank	N/A	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of project on business – do not isolate community [by eliminating access to Broadway] • Listen to public input [Please make sure the decision makers, CDOT/FHWA, take public input from this meeting into consideration when determining the outcome of the access to Broadway]
58.	Patricia T.	N/A	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [New] Motel on 84th → traffic

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

					Facilitated Discussion	<p>increase, access to the motel [Please do not eliminate access to the motel on 84th Street]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question – Congestion taken into account? [Has additional traffic congestion been taken into account when making decisions and planning for the Combined Alternative?]
59.	Joe M.	N/A	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety of Pecos for children [Concern was expressed for the safety of children that go to school in the vicinity of the Pecos interchange and that the closing of Broadway would increase local traffic on streets near the schools] <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School zone 2. Closing Broadway – impact on safety • Loss of jobs in area [The closing of Broadway access would impact businesses in the area which could lead to closure of businesses, thus creating job losses]
60.	Anonymous	N/A	N/A	4/9/09	Public Meeting Facilitated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toyota – tri-fold meetings about meeting – service Mt. States Toyota

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

					Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taxpayers <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Don't want CDOT to make decision [I do not support CDOT making the decision to eliminate Broadway access from US 36] 2. More meetings to talk about status of access [Support was expressed for additional meetings designed to specifically address the issue of Broadway access] • Each alt. has at least 3 school zones – not a good alternative (access businesses – tax base) • Unfunded or underfunded projects [Concern was expressed for the costs of planning for unfunded or underfunded transportation projects]
61.	Thomas Tuttle	Denver	80216	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns: Dramatically increase traffic on side streets endangering children. Leave the interchange the same or build the flyby and include access to Broadway.
62.	Jeannie Dillon	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns: Emergency vehicle response time. Additional traffic down already crowded streets. People getting frustrated with additional difficulties and being careless in

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						residential areas. Suggestion: Keep a ramp for Broadway.
63.	Greg McCubbin	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Keep in mind the heavy truck traffic from both regular dry freight and open construction trailers that go from the east onto s. bound Broadway! The FHA ought to review the incoming traffic from EB 76 onto NB I-25 between 4-5 PM. It is backed up half-way to Pecos St. exit on some days! 5 lanes down to 3, oh-boy!
64.	Mercedes Mellenderndt	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	How many families are impacted by imminent domain? How many businesses will be closed due to this? Are there any plans to widen Pecos? Turning to Del Norte from Pecos are wrecks waiting to happen. Pecos and Del Norte is terrible, it's so hard to access Del Norte from Pecos with the I-36 exit. Near wrecks happen there everyday. The amount of noise from the highway is already bothersome. My husband works at Great Scotts Eatery and he sees wrecks there at least once a month. It's dangerous. Already twice the traffic is numerous accidents waiting to happen. Not to mention the business loss, home loss.
65.	Landon Jones			4/9/09	Email Comment	Concerns: Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: There are several reasons not to close off the Broadway exit!! The main reasons I can't see it go: 1. I have a family of 3 little ones ranging ages 3-8 years. The thought of having

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<p>an emergency w/ one of them & not having a quick response... I can't even imagine. If something were to happen & the medics couldn't get here in time would devastate me. My family is most important to me, as anyone else would agree. 2. ties into #1. The increased volume puts my 3 kids in an unsafe neighborhood. 2 of my kids attend schools on Conifer making it unsafe for them to travel to & from school. And again, if something were to happen to them, the emergency team wouldn't show up in adequate time.</p> <p>Questions/comments: Other reasons - higher taxes, lower property value, increased insurance, higher crime, increased traffic.</p>
66.	Jeremy Gudenkauf			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	<p>Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: We need that entrance so we can use the highway to get to our church, recreation center, the mall, and getting to Boulder. Comments: Don't take away our access to I-36.</p>
67.	Emma Gudenkauf			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	<p>Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: We have conducted a lot of our business in Westminster since moving here in the early 1970s. We need that access to have access to the West. There are no side streets that would be wide or large enough to accommodate the overflow of displaced traffic which would cause major congestion in heavy traffic times and cause additional problems on 72nd near Pecos where 2 schools</p>

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						are located. If they are truly planning to fix the bridge at 84th & I-25, which needs it, that would cut off all highway access for this area additionally for months and 84th Ave is already congested. It would also be detrimental to the small businesses that need that access to remain open in an already struggling economy.
68.	Rudy Manzanares			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: I have driven the Broadway Access for over twenty years. It is the closest and easiest exit for a person on disability to reach I-25. Also to access Greenwood Blvd. I drive to 88th & Huron every other day to take other disabled friends to their Dr. appointments. The entire area bordered by 88th Ave to I-25, to Hwy 36 & I-25 is where all my friends and family live. Closing this road will put an unnecessary burden and the wear and tear of my old vehicle, not to mention the extra gas. Please do the American thing and leave the Broadway access open. Respectfully yours, Rudy Manzanares
69.	Darlene Etheridge			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: The increased amount of traffic that it would cause on Conifer and Broadway, with having a elementary school and middle school on Conifer, the safety of children going to and from school. Also, the

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						inconvenience it would cause people in this area using 270 that use the Broadway exit would now have to go to I-25 to 84th Ave to get to Conifer and the traffic is bad enough to get to Conifer let alone having more people using Conifer to access 36. Plus the impact it would cause the businesses in this area would be devastating to them. We don't need anymore changes. You've taken our easy access to I-25 from us when you closed the Broadway ramp. Enough is enough!
70.	Michael Bogan	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns about CA: Traffic on Conifer Road - schools, only a collector type street (not an arterial) with many intersections with limited visibility. Suggestions for improvements/minimize impacts: keep Broadway access from both I-25 and I-270 Comments: Bike path concern on Little Dry Creek east of Federal where a small section isn't really a path - actually gravel road.
71.	Fran Donato	Blue Bell	19422	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	To Whom It May Concern: I represent the owners of 7350 Broadway Associates, LP, (the Westwood College Campus). We have recently heard from our tenant, Westwood College, of your consideration of eliminating the access from I-25 Southbound and I-270 Westbound. Westwood indicated this is a huge concern to them, as it is to us and many others. Cutting off access to the residential neighborhood and numerous commercial

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<p>properties in the area would have a devastating economic impact. Residential and commercial property values would suffer greatly and jobs would undoubtedly be lost. Westwood has hundreds of non-traditional students who depend on quick ingress and egress to the campus to get to and from their jobs efficiently during the day and evening. We urge you to find alternatives to accomplish your long-range planning goals that would not be so detrimental to the lives and livelihoods of many in the area. Our local property manager, Pete Cox of Axis Commercial Realty, will be in attendance at your upcoming meeting. He would be happy to respond to any questions you may have regarding our concerns about the access elimination being considered. Sincerely, 7350 Broadway Associates, LP Fran Donato</p>
72.	Roberta Jackson			4/9/09	Email Comment	<p>Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: I have lived in my home since the house was built (some 60 years ago). Pecos St. has always been an outlet street to the north and south. If the project goes through Pecos St. will be swamped with traffic and dangerous intersections. The local business places will be stressed and we will lose some of them. These are the business places I depend on. I think that CDOT have many more urgent places to spend their money and time than this flyover ramp. Fix</p>

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						the rotting bridges and elevated sections of I-70.
73.	Leslie Welte	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I moved here and work around the entire metro area. I used to be 20 minutes from Boulder, Denver, and Aurora. I can no longer say that.
74.	Dave DeSalvo	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I would like to see more Hwy access not less. I have been working out of this area for 10+ years and have never seen any access projects only the tear down of other ramps. I would like to retain my hwy access to my workplace.
75.	Brian Coe	Denver	80021	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	This is completely unacceptable and will be stopped in it's tracks. Stop now and quit spending our tax dollars. This whole project will create crime infested slum of 5 business parks and is completely unacceptable. The ramp from I-25 S to Broadway was rebuilt all of 5 years or less ago. To rebuild again is a waste of money.
76.	Craig Emmert	Thornton	80229	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I would like to suggest option B that includes the fly-over plus the off ramp and onramp from the Broadway exit of US 36. I feel this will keep the business and neighborhoods a viable place to work and to live.
77.	Robert Graham	Denver	80209	4/9/09	Email Comment	I am a part owner of ground at SWC 88th and 36. Would like to know if the future plans of the corridor include any taking of land along it and, if so, which side of Hwy. 36 would the taking be most likely to happen.

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

78.	Paul Serr	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	The neighborhood will be cut off from access to all systems. Find another way to get access to I-36 other than removing the off ramp. The removal of other access points has been painful. This would be the nail in the coffin for our community. They believe that it will improve traffic and I disagree. Please leave us some if not all access.
79.	Kristine Edwards	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I agree regarding removing off ramp from I-25 south crossing Broadway - then until I-36. Why this hasn't been done before now - well??? My concern is noise pollution. I don't like to open my windows due to the cars on both I-25 and I-36. I live very close to I-25 but at least 4 miles from 36. The roar of traffic is horrendous. Putting in another few lanes of freeway will only increase. What will be done to cut this type of pollution down? I would greatly appreciate a response to my concern. Thank you.
80.	Dave Reigel	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	My main concern is for the safety of our neighborhood. Put a fly over off of I-25 S. to leave lower portion. The closing of this ramp will lower all the property values in this area. The closing will cause safety problems.
81.	Barbara Cottrell	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns: Longer drive to get off at Pecos or 84th which is already crowded. Businesses moving out because of closure and vacant buildings. More crime. In addition to the economy that already has lowered the price of

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						homes, the closure will decrease it more and we will not be able to sell. Do the fly over and leave us our exit and entrances!
82.	Sandra Krzysztoson	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Quit spending our tax dollar without considering that the public and home owners want. Especially since we are the ones who will pay for it. Leave Broadway access alone from I-25 and I-76 and I-270 along with I-36. All it does is mess up peoples livelihood and cause all kinds of danger for kids around school. Excess traffic that they don't need. I am still upset about closing entrance from 70th Ave. to I-76 and I-270 along with Northbound I-25. You didn't care whether it would affect a lot of people plus business.
83.	Rosemary Tutt	Louisville	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Closing the off ramps at Broadway from 2 highways makes a burden on people living in this area. It is the only way to come home from town and from the west without going many blocks out of your way. We are senior citizens and need some consideration.
84.	Andrew DeHurers	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	We need access to get in and out of here. Leave things as they are and open up the exit we had under Broadway and 36 to I-25. Closing up these exits will also hurt business and probably increase the traffic through the neighborhood.
85.	Kevin Kitzmann	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I am concerned about Indy 500 traffic on Conifer Rd.
86.	Richard Bott	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting	Concerns: On-Off ramp at 36 and Broadway

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

					Written Comment	interchange which would greatly increase traffic on Pecos St - 72nd Ave - 74th Ave - 68th Ave. Especially "truck" traffic. Suggestions: Keep the Broadway interchange open. Closing the interchange will cause many ill effects to the many businesses, home owners and lifestyle of all the people living and working in this greater area.
87.	Lu Ann Nelson	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	We need access to the highway! Don't close the ramps. We have lived here a long time - the people who want to go to Boulder can find another way!
88.	Anne Norwood			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Cut the speed on US 36 until the wall goes up.
89.	Maria Ramirez	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns about CA: Still is the traffic issue The effect on the community Accesses, accidents, businesses Suggestions to improve or minimize impacts: We only need an access from I-25 to I-36. No need to change anything else. We cannot afford to shut down the Broadway access no matter what. Comments: We are a good community & would like to stay that way. If we get a Fast Track up here that is all we need (Light rail) Downtown to West Denver. North Denver to Boulder. Light Rail is our answer.
90.	Joseph Richards			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: Save me so much more

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

					Comment
91.	Thomas Vanderbur			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment gas on my way to church and youth teaching and especially time in order to get there. It would hamper many of the small businesses chances to succeed, grow, and prosper.
92.	Shannon McFee			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: It would add a mile to our commute, as we would have to exit at Pecos and drive back to Broadway. Caregivers that come from Thornton would have extra miles to drive. Questions/Comments: Why do you people even begin to think that this is a good thing? We already have to drive extra miles to get on the highways.
93.	Alicia Sanchez			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: It would add to my gas bill every month for the fact would have to drive 1 mile out of my way to work and 1 mile from work. That is 60 miles a month. i do not think it would be fair to our commute. I don't think it is very fair for the businesses and schools on Broadway either. Questions/comments: They have already closed one exit to get on I-25. Why do they have to close the exit to get on Broadway?
					Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: The proposed closing of the Broadway exit would be a terrible inconvenience for me. All of my close friends and a lot of family live right off that exit. I am

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						a single mother who is not able to financially support the extra gas or repairs to my car having to go further out of my way. This would be a terrible inconvenience for me and my family limiting my visits which mean a lot to my family and also my friends. Please think all actions and consequences this would make for people and their families. Thank you.
94.	Rosina Lucero			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: "STOP" We need both local accesses to our community, it would be a major impact. We cannot keep children safe, having big rigs and etc. going through our streets. Schools will become danger zones, as children cross streets. There is a number of schools in our area. Local businesses will lose because no one is going the extra mile and return to give them business. Loss of tax base, when businesses will move, some where else. Empty buildings are a place for vandals, and etc. Isolation from emergency equipment in our older community. It will take them extra precious minutes to get where they need to go. It could be LIFE OR DEATH!
95.	John Recknor			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: Have to go to Pecos instead. Leave off ramp open.
96.	Katy Jones			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: This would cause a much higher volume of traffic creating a very

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						unsafe area for our kids in the neighborhood! We have multiple schools off Broadway & Conifer. Closing this ramp would not be safe on any level for these students. This will cause more crime in the area & cause our property to go down b/c of added violence & the increase of traffic. This will also cause a delay w/ emergency vehicles & personnel equaling a slower response time. This is not a wise decision to close off the ramp. The negative out ways the positive.
97.	Pauline Griffin			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: As a long-time resident of Adams CO, I have watched time and time again decisions be made with little regard to the people most impacted by these decisions. I have seven houses west of Pecos at about 81st (Orchard Drive) and already there is a heavy volume of traffic as it is one of the few streets that goes all the way from Northglenn to 38th Ave. With the closure of the Broadway access those folks used to traveling on Broadway would have to come to Pecos to get on the highway making for even more of a bottle neck than ever. Closing the Broadway access would also severely impact all the businesses along that corridor.
98.	Bob & Joyce Knapp	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns: No easy access on Broadway - have too many new address in this area since the design was made. Must keep a Broadway exit.

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

99.	Randy Barrce	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	This could be the final straw to shut down our business. You have already created a hardship for our customers and clients to get to us and now you want to close us off completely. Open access for our businesses, not close us off. You will be responsible for many businesses closing their doors. Are you comfortable with that? I think the group that came up with this idea is incompetent and should be ashamed of the work/ideas performed. CDOT should be making it easier for small businesses, not harder. We were not the ones that got free money. Some of us actually have to work for it.
100.	John Wheeler	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Option B or C so we can get off on Broadway.
101.	Carrol and Robert Rankin	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns: Loss of business - Less access than we have now to Broadway - More travel when coming from Brighton I-76 - Inconvenience. Suggest: Leave it as is. We drive on Sherman St. You already took away 2 of our entrances to I-25. Now our access to Broadway. We already have a worse mousetrap situation that I-70. Don't make things worse. We are elderly and don't need any more things taken away. It will add extra time to our commute. They have already taken access away from us think it would add more traffic to Pecos. They already have us boxed in now. I think they

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						should leave it alone. All they have done is move the mousetrap down here instead at I-70.
102.	Thu Huong Ngyen	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I agree with option A.
103.	Filbert Hermosillo	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concern: We not having exit from 25 to 36 and 270 to Broadway. We can't have it both ways since I25 exit to Broadway is only 5 years old. Plan better now. You can do what the people want not what the government thinks we need. We need exit from I25 to Broadway and 270 to Broadway. Please listen to the people. We can make this possible. We are losing our central way to the Highway for the last 5 years.
104.	Sharon Snow	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns: Crime, losing business, higher home insurance, more traffic. Fire or emergency to get to my home. More time and gas to get to my Dr. appt. Suggests: Leave it as is. You already took our I-76 - 270 Exit without letting use now.
105.	Sharon Snow	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns: They will be put more swigh in more traffic for our school. Less my home value. Up my home insurance. More gas for use to go to work. More crime. More junk car. Leave as it is. You will have more junk because the state patrol can't get to us.
106.	Jim Sanders	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I am concerned about impact of additional traffic in neighborhoods and school areas. I travel these roads 3-6 times a day. I have yet

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						to see traffic from I-25 to 36/Broadway West backed up more that a 1 light wait. You have already eliminated access from our location to northbound I-25 or to 270. Your decision will probably force us to Relocate after 25 years at this location. I think you should at least consider an exit from southbound I-25 to 70th Ave. Excuse me if I am less than confident that the local business owners or homeowners opinion will have any impact on your decision. Not only are the businesses and neighborhoods to be inconvenienced but we are left shouldering the burden of costs by increased taxes.
107.	Patricia Trujillo			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Once the motel is open on 84th (more congestion and traffic), I believe with the closing it would create a great deal more congestion on 84th and on Conifer/Broadway. Leave it as it is. It was a mistake to close the northbound ramp.
108.	Rhonda Reckner	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	It will increase traffic on my street and add miles to my drive. It will be much harder for people to come to my home. There are safety issues with now and ice on Del Norte. It will also increase traffic at Pecos. Do not close any more on or off ramps into the neighborhood. Please do not take away my quiet neighborhood by increasing traffic on my street. I am also concerned about the safety for children and driveways that are on the hilly area of Del Norte. Please do not do

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						this!!
109.	Debbie Frank	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I would like to see the "Option B" plan for our community in Federal Heights and the 36 corridor. I would like Option "C" from 270 W to Broadway. Allow for the flyby from I-25 S to 36 W and an off ramp at Broadway from I-25 S and an on ramp from Broadway W to 36. You need to give us the exits that allows all traffic west from 270/76 and from I-25 south to exit at Broadway. What are you thinking? Why can't we add a flyby to it?? We need these exits!!!!
110.	Seth Sacks	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	The Broadway access should not be closed because commercial vehicles that supply area businesses would be cut off or hampered. I propose a separate study by given weight against the overall corridor development.
111.	Carl Jones	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I have taken a straw poll of our existing customers and have concluded we would lose approximately 20% of our existing customer base due to limited access to our business. This would reduce our workforce from 12 to 10 employees. In 2008 we collected \$42,789.94 in sales taxes. This would reduce State County RTD and stadium tax income by \$8558.00. None of this reduction is acceptable to either the business or the taxpayer. The access must remain open.
112.	Spencer Jenckes	Aurora	80017	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I don't like having the BRT stations on the shoulder. Somebody said tonight that would be a safety issue for busses having to merge

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						form the BRT lane across all lanes to the station. I agree with him and think that defeats the concept or BRT. Someone suggested getting rid of the bike path because no one would use it. I disagree. The proposed bike path would go between Westminster and Boulder and tons of people use bikes in Boulder. Also, no one is going to take up biking if a path isn't there or in good condition. People will remain addicted to their cars.
113.	Duane & Alta Eng			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Impact the closing of Broadway Access would have on you: I believe closing the access from Broadway to I-36 and I-25 will cause major problems for the people that live in this area. We sure don't need to do something that will increase the traffic on Broadway and Conifer. We sure as hell don't need that especially with schools on both sides of Conifer. I think most people that live in this area use that access when going to Westminster, Boulder, and other areas West. I'm sure the closing of this access will increase the commercial traffic in the area considerably. Thank you.
114.	Harry Rockwell	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Cannot access Broadway, police, fire, other services to contact people. I-76 is shut off now go to 84th jump across 4 lanes traffic to go 76 east.
115.	Sharon Richards	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: I don't want any of the

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

					Comment	proposed highway changes in my neighborhood!
116.	Sharon Richards	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I would like to see option B and C combined. I-25 south to 36 west flyby and an off ramp at I-25 south at Broadway.
117.	Donald Smith			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: That is my exit from I-76 to Broadway. From the East, & from the South Bound. I-25. Now to go North on I-25, I have to go to 84th and to go East on I-76. That puts me out of my way and more time. We don't need delivery trucks going past schools to get to these businesses on Pecos or Conifer.
118.	Angel Apodaca			4/9/09	Email Comment	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: As a working employee and full time student, I must use the Broadway access 6 days a week. With school and living expenses, as well as work, money and time are already a crunch in my life. Closing the access would create an even bigger problem than I already have. I would have to get up earlier, drive more, leave earlier, and unfortunately rush from place to place. I have no extra money to spare for gas and extra wear and tear the driving would cause to my car. I'm just trying to create a better life for myself, and closing the Broadway access would create a bigger problem not just for me, but for my classmates as well. More than you could

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						imagine. It would be in the best interest of, not just the residents, but all of Colorado to keep the access open.
119.	Laura Riegelman			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: As a neighbor and patron, I believe this will create a hardship for those living near Pecos + Broadway. Broadway businesses will lose business. Pecos will gain traffic. I am concerned about increased traffic for Pecos because of the schools. I teach music in the area and I am concerned for parents & children in the neighborhood. I am also disappointed for the business in this area that will be affected. This area is already oppressed. We need to stimulate business and improvements. Questions/Comments: Can't you please find an alternative to this project?
120.	Anonymous			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Ramp without closing access to US 36.
121.	Bill Kremsner	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns: Interchange to Egress shall remain as present - Option B has been that way for 50 years. Do not change configuration. Any change to present configurations will have many consequences to real estate commercial values to business @ 70th and Broadway and future businesses. If you don't have budget to keep as is, then just leave alone until enough money is appropriated.
122.	Dena Nelsen	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written	Comments: If this requires a different act, then why are we here tonight???

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

					Comment
123.	Gail McDugle	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment Would not have as easy access to my neighborhood. The businesses could have a loss of business due to inconvenience and no easy access. The Broadway exit already exists. I see no reason to close it. "If it isn't broken, don't fix it"!
124.	Paul Olivas	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment The main concern is finding an alternative to displacing the 8 residents on Samuel Drive south of the US 36 corridor!!! This will only be used for an off ramp! The water treatment ponds, discussed with your engineers can be constructed using the Venture Inn and restaurant property! These properties have only been a negative impact on the neighborhood community, especially the Venture Inn! Utilize the property areas of the Venture Inn, and the restaurant to the east of the motel. These businesses are not prosperous and there has been overwhelming police activity due to drugs, homeless, even deaths! These properties would better suit your needs. And enable the residents to keep their property and precious homes, with a better quality of life. I suggest along with other neighbors, to highly consider leaving the 8 homes mentioned above out of your planning! Introduce the options to utilize the Venture Inn and the restaurant property to all of our advantage! These properties are better suited. Once again,

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						our properties are only for an off ramp and treatment pond. There isn't so much traffic coming off onto Pecos on the south side of US 36. Please consider. Thank you!
125.	Pat Hall	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concern: No access to our neighborhood. Suggest: Make sure they maintain access as it stands today to Western Hills. I don't know why this wasn't planned better 4-5 years ago when all the planning was done on this intersection.
126.	Norma Bott	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	No on and off access at I-36 and Broadway - This would put too much car and truck traffic in the residential area - too much traffic for schools also. Keep the on and off ramps on I-36 and Broadway open. The businesses in that area would also be affected negatively - also this of fire and police ambulances. Also, I thought there was a problem in this economic recession repairing bridges and roads existing now that need repair - Why are you spending tax dollars here where there is NO problem with the bridges?
127.	Michelle Carey	Denver	80229	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	This would cost us our business. There has to be some access to Broadway from I-25. Either leave it alone, or put an on and off ramp on 70th Ave. Moves the traffic from 36 to 70th Ave. This small area is home to a lot of people and hundreds of businesses. Don't hurt the economy worse by doing this.
128.	Kari Tayler	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting	We use the Broadway exchange everyday for

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

					Written Comment	school and business. This closure would impact our commute and make it 10 or 15 min longer.
129.	Margaret Collins	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concern: No emergency Vehicle access. Suggest: Connect the 2 Bronco Roads the thru street with the dap end go across the field and finish the sound wall. Leave the exit ramp right where it has been for the last 53 years. We like it this way.
130.	Felisa Schwadron	Erie	80516	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns regarding the closure of off ramp access from I-25 Broadway. This has an extremely negative impact on the community. If traffic exits off 84th instead and then comes through Broadway the affect to the schools is terrible (Valley View, Global Leadership Academy and Western hills Campus). I can't understand how closing this can be justified. You are putting our children in grave danger. Suggest: Also increase general purpose lanes between Boulder and I-25. The general purpose lanes are already congested, why add another managed lane when these are not congested?
131.	Troy Becker	Denver	80216	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	My facility services 1600 people on a continual basis. Most of these people are coming south on I-25 and using Broadway heading south. Without access to Broadway from US 36 W and I-25 south, they will be forced to exit @84th Ave S on Conifer or use 58th Ave. N on Broadway (which is

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						constantly blocked by a train). I suggest leaving the existing ramp in place.
132.	Larry Richards	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	The last closings of exits at Broadway (Broadway Ramp to So. I-25 and E 270 Hwy 76) has increased traffic heavily on 84th Ave and also 70th and Broadway. It creates dangerous jams on 84th Ave in particular. It also has people speeding up and down Conifer Rd. in hopes of beating traffic to the next exit. i.e. 58th Ave. Putting our children in school zones at greater risk. The Broadway and I-25 Interchange should remain the way it is with a south bound I-25 exit at Broadway with a 270 and Hwy 76 exit at Broadway. Closing more accesses will only make traffic worse and make the residents suffer longer more hazardous drives in and out of our neighborhoods. None of the options allow for all existing ramps to remain open and they should stay open.
133.	Pat Kizziah	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	You've already shut off my access to 76 - 270. I got no notice. The train is always blocking 58 and Broadway to get to I-25. Leave it alone! It will destroy what is left of my neighborhood, raise my insurance and increase crime and lower my home and increase traffic.
134.	Dorothy Fehringer	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Protect small businesses.

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

135.	Jess Van House	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I use the I-270 to Broadway exit everyday. I believe it is very wise to keep I-25 to Broadway exit. Add new access from I-25 to 36 Boulder with flyover Broadway – no stopping at Broadway. I use the exits 2 to 3 times a day from home to work as I'm in construction.
136.	Craig Jones			4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	To address the closing of access to Broadway from southbound I-25 and westbound US36 I would like to present the following facts. We opened our business 9 years ago in this area for accessibility to all major freeways. We are running a service-oriented business in reducing down time for heavy equipment. Our biggest selling quality is response time. Since we have opened our access to I-25 northbound is limited and so is I-76 eastbound. We now have to go to 58th avenue, hoping there is no train that can have you sitting anywhere from 15 minutes to 1 hour. Or we have to back track to Pecos, taking more time than necessary. This has negative impact on what our company is all about. We strive to be the best in what we do like all small business. We are already hampered by these closures. Now there will be another that directly impacts customer coming to our shop. They come from Thornton North Glenn even from Longmont. This is vital access for them, look to the fore mentioned train. I would find an easier place

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						to go too. It is not only my business I am concerned about but also all of the small business owners in the area. There was a great deal of money invested in developing north Broadway in this area and they are very new and probably struggling in this economic climate as it is. Then here comes another way to decrease traffic to those businesses. The other issues are gridlock and safety. Pecos can not handle the over flow. For a good example of this is Ward Road at rush hour. I do not have to tell any one that there is a lot more foot traffic here. To increase in this area is to increase chances for accidents.
137.	Kay Frank	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	There's too much traffic already on Pecos and Federal and 84th to get on interstate36. We need for our safety and the school children all 3 to keep our connection with I36. Option B and Option C combined. Need off ramp for schools. Need RTD buses need to access on and off the Boulder turnpike? You have in the last 40 years taken away our Zuni exit and entrance off the Boulder turnpike. You have taken away I270 and I25 from our neighborhood. You have left us with no adequate residential streets for walking traffic. There are no stop lights between Greenwood Blvd and Broadway all the way to 84th. Please pay attention to your tax papers of the last 4 years!!!
138.	Oskar Baker	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting	Concern: No access to neighborhood from I-

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

					Written Comment	76 or 270. Suggest: Do nothing. The roads are fine.
139.	Scott Reno	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I vote for option B. I-25 s. bound access to both I-36 AND Broadway.
140.	Don Woodard	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	None of options A, B, C are really acceptable. Option C needs to include a ramp connection from I-25. Both directions need to have access to Broadway.
141.	Ken Nieberson	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Weight limits on trucks if they get off on 84 and Conifer restricted streets south bound on Greenwood Blvd. Going south is restricted 7000 lbs. and no parking on those streets over 7000 lbs. Streets going from 2 lanes into on Greenwood at El Paso to Broadway. That would be one big traffic jam for cars and semis.
142.	Ronald Fenner	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns: Improvements planned west of Broadway - shuttling down our access and improving facilities west of here do not benefit this neighborhood. Suggests: Option D - Access to Broadway from S I-25, and from W 76/270 - Forget about a bike path and improve what our neighborhood depends on - access to and from home to all directions. Within the past few years our access to south bound I-25 was moved to 70th Ave. Within the past few months our access to northbound 25 and eastbound 76/270 was eliminated. Now no option is available to keep the limited access we have left.

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

143.	Rosemary Wethington	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	If the homes on Samuel Drive are demolished, that puts my street 74th Ave. much closer to Hwy 36 than I want to be. It would lower the value of my home. Do everything you can to minimize the negative impact it will have over the long time homeowners in the area. It will make it harder to sell out homes also, should we need to sell, many of us are older and will need that income. I am in favor of building a "flyer" at the I25 - Broadway exit.
144.	Eric Bauer	Commerce City	80022	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Minimizing impact would be to keep current access from SB I-25 to Broadway and WB270 access to Broadway, while including the flyover. Improve regional movement w/o impacting local movement. Please do not use information and decisions made over 15 years ago!
145.	Kim Davis	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns: Congesting already congested interchanges I-25 and 84th and Pecos and US36. Suggestions: Be pro-active rather than reactive. Expand at those interchanges first.
146.	Ted Nelson	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	We need access to the highway - how about 911? Leave it alone! If they want to go to Boulder they can find a way. We have lived here forever! Leave the highway alone!
147.	Carol Carey	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I'm not exactly clear what the options are because I just became aware of this at this meeting tonight. How would you like it if we

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						closed the access to your place of work or to your homes and make you drive miles out of your way to get there? Think about that! I don't think it is fair for us to be penalized and forced with this inconvenience. We have very small roads over here as it is and a lot of traffic, especially school traffic with small children. Now it would be impossible to get kids to school on time and may cause a lot of wrecks with the havoc of the congestion it would cause on the roadways.
148.	Mary Leal	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Please keep our access to Broadway. I don't want to go all the way to Pecos or Federal.
149.	Susan Glaser	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Concerns about CA: 20 years ago we had great access; this is all we have left. Why do we have to lose it also? Just because we aren't as rich as Boulderites? Suggestions to improve or minimize impacts: There has to be a way to keep our last ramps. County services and schools need to count for something.
150.	Debra Jennings	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: First - I, my family do not want the increased traffic on Conifer/Broadway! DO NOT want this street looking like Washington St. from 80th to I-70! This is such a ridiculous idea of these ramp closures!! When they closed the ramp @ Broadway + 36 it has increased traffic significantly from 84 Ave. to 58 St. - It's

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						horrible! Not to mention the increased traffic on 84 now. Kids will not be safe walking to school or play - We will have big rigs going up + down Conifer. Our house values will drop significantly! Our prop. insurance + probably auto as well will increase big time! The emergency response time for fire, medical etc. will be slowed!! Crime in this are will go up. This is such a BAD IDEA to close those ramps - WE need to keep them open!!! Before we know it - more stop lights will be added on Conifer.
151.	Mary E. Robinson	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Comments: I have lived in this neighborhood for almost 48 years, and I object to having our access roads cut off!!!
152.	Debbie Richards	Boulder	80301	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Impact the closing of the Broadway Access would have on you: Dear Department of Transportation: Do not remove public access to our neighborhood. I realize it is an older neighborhood and the access currently available affects Hwy 36, 270, 76, and I-25, etc. However, it is for these reasons we have chosen to live here. We do not want local businesses to close or schools to be affected. Sincerely, Debbie Richards
153.	Patricia Farley	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	I am a student at Westwood College on Broadway. I also attend church on 82nd and Pecos and shop on 84th and Pecos. 4000 more cars a day would impede excess and smooth traffic to Pecos. It would be like driving the highways again but on local streets. Maybe

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						you should use the money to fox the existing roads, bridges and by-passes we already have!
154.	Nick Brendes	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Public Meeting Written Comment	Close the ramp.
155.	James and Vicki Barton	Westminster	80030	4/9/09	Email Comment	We would like to compliment the EIS process and say that the preferred alternative has help keep my neighborhood intact and probably reduced the cost of the highway improvements. We would also like to thank again Mr. Greg Jamieson for his communications and answers to our property questions. Our only other comment at this time is about the proposed closing of the US 36 and Broadway accesses. We feel that the closing of the access would cause many of the local commercial operations to close as well as cause many vacancies in the neighborhood. This action would adversely affect the sales and property tax bases. Other problems would be poor emergency response time to the area, putting more commercial traffic into the residential areas and causing extra miles driven by the residents to access their homes. We believe that a redesign of the highways could be done, giving better access to us36 I25 and I270 and at the same time leaving the Broadway area intact with the same or better access to homes and business.
156.	Chris Cline	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Email Comment	I would like to dispute the project of taking away our access ramps on Broadway. The

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<p>traffic will increase tremendously if this change takes place. There are 3 schools on Conifer that will have increased traffic and will decrease the safety on this street. The rest of the neighborhood will be affected with the increase in traffic on roads like Del Norte and other side streets. This will majorly impact the safety of all residents and their children. The home values are already decreasing and this will shut down the entire access in this neighborhood. This will be a complete travesty to all residents. The businesses along Conifer and Broadway will majorly be affected. This will most likely close them down for good. Please, let's look at other options and study the effects of doing this. I agree with connecting the interstate with Hwy 36 with a flyover, but we still NEED the ramps to attach to Broadway.</p>
157.	Jim Kumar	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Email Comment	<p>Living in the neighborhood, access to the businesses and homes will be greatly disrupted from loss of business access and loss of property. The closure of the Broadway exit will dramatically increase traffic on Pecos. The intersection of 72nd and Pecos ranks in the top 10 for pedestrian deaths in the state of Colorado. As traffic moves down Pecos for other access to businesses, it passes numerous schools. Mickey's Top Sirloin, American Tape & Label, Pipers Local 208, Paulino Gardens, Artistic Flowers, Swiss</p>

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						Auto are all businesses I patronize and am concerned that the lack of access may cause them to go out of business, which will upset my life, as a lifelong resident of this community. If the flyover is done and access cannot be kept open, I would prefer that the flyover not be built at all. I plan to use my vote to echo these sentiments.
158.	Zoe Reese	Thornton	80233	4/9/09	Email Comment	I disagree with the current plan to close access to roadway from I36. This is a neighborhood which needs access for both business and homes. There has been a recent move of the Toyota dealership, there is an industrial park along with the park-n-ride and other businesses. These businesses are the tax base for this area of Adams County. There has to be a way to design a fly over while continuing the neighborhood access. What are you thinking? Is the assumption that no one uses the east or west access? This is vital to the health of the neighborhood, health of the county etc. so be creative and figure something out.
159.	Lee Wilkerson	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Email Comment	I own two companies at 70th and Broadway that employs a total of 160 employees and large construction trucks with trailers and backhoes. Removal of the Broadway exit off of SB I 25 will cause employees driving these trucks while towing construction equipment to take alternative routes that will greatly increase the risk of an accident to property or

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						person. We may also be faced with the unwanted cost of finding and moving into another facility should access be an issue.
160.	Ivan Hulsey	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Email Comment	I came here in 1971 with all of the highway work that was going on, I thought there was no highway planning commissioner and they still don't! It took them all winter long to redo work on Pecos. If you want to spend some money, spend it on something that is crumbling, not something that is not broken.
161.	Greg Salos	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Email Comment	They will be put more swag in more traffic for our school. Less my home value. Up my home in. More gas for use to go to work more crime. More junk cars. Leave the area as is. You will have more junk because the state patrol can't get to you.
162.	April Jackson	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Email Comment	I am writing you to let you know that I am for improving US36; however I do NOT WANT OUR ACCESS TO BE TAKEN AWAY to the BROADWAY exit. Taking our access ramps away from Broadway/US36 would hurt the value of our home and take away from our neighboring businesses. If you take away our Broadway access it will also take away the response time of our emergency vehicles and send more Semi-Trucks through our neighborhoods and down Pecos. Our kids go to school in our neighborhood. They walk to school and having more traffic having by their schools is very alarming to me. I worry enough as it is with traffic, and this would just

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						add to the stress of them walking to and from school. I take the Bus to work and I catch it at the Broadway Park-n-Ride. Please do not take that access away either.
163.	Jess VanHorne	Denver	80221	4/9/09	Email Comment	I use I-270 to Broadway exit everyday. I believe it is very wise to keep I-25 to Broadway exit. Add new access from I-25 to 36 Boulder with flyover Broadway - No stopping at Broadway. I use the exits 2 to 3 times a day from home to work and I'm in construction.
164.	Elia Fisher	Denver	80216	4/9/09	Email Comment	As a private citizen living within the transportation corridor, I feel that Alternative #2 provides the best option for the residents who live adjacent to the US 36 and Interstate 25. Further, I feel that the center median lane (proposed BRT/HOV lane) should be reserved exclusively for Bus Rapid Transit. I feel that the footprint of US 36 and Interstate 25 should not be expanded, but rather kept at current width. I would like to see current general purpose lanes converted to exclusive BRT and other mass transit right-of-way. Lastly, I feel that if HOV access is provided in the center median, the minimal number of vehicle occupants should be increased from 2 to 4. Thank you very much.
165.	Denise Nagle	Denver	80221	4/10/09	Email Comment	Please do not close the Broadway ramp it is vital to our community.
166.	Marco Cabanillas		80020	4/10/09	Email Comment	Request to sign-up for the Mailing List.
167.	Neal Lurie		80304	4/13/09	Email Comment	I'm concerned about the unnecessary zigging

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						<p>of the bikeway south of US 36 from Coal Creek in Louisville to the underpass 200 yards to the east.</p> <p>Excessive zigging and zagging are annoying at best, reduce mobility, and decrease the effectiveness of transportation mobility. A more direct route is strongly preferred by bicyclists.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Why not just stay on the north side of US 36 by the golf course and, to protect from errant golf balls, cover this 150 yard portion of the bikeway with a mesh fencing, similar to the round mesh cover that is used for the bike/pedestrian crossing in Boulder over Foothills parkway just south of Arapahoe? Another example is the bike path that runs on the south edge of the Flatirons Golf Course in Boulder.</p> <p>These provide good models for ways to keep bicyclists/pedestrians safe from errant golf balls ... without unnecessary zigging and zagging to the routing.</p> <p>Having a more direct route 365 days a year is more important than getting extra sun exposure to melt ice 9 days during the winter.</p>
168.	Adam Lawrence	Boulder	80303	4/16/09	Email Comment	<p>HI, <input type="checkbox"/> I am an Environmental Studies student at the University of Colorado Boulder and I am specializing in the EIS process. I, along with three other students are creating our own complete version of an EIS for this US 36</p>

US 36 EIS Public Comments 3/26/09 to 4/15/09

Comments include comments received at (or during) the April 2009 Public Meetings and submitted through US 36 EIS Website

						Corridor project. I missed the public meeting in Boulder recently and I am interested in receiving any information regarding the Combined Alternative Plan. I would very much appreciate any help you could give. Thank you, Adam Lawrence
--	--	--	--	--	--	--