



## Foundation for consensus?

By **BOB BERWYN**  
[summit daily news](#)

May 4, 2005

SUMMIT COUNTY — A series of community outreach meetings held across the I-70 corridor coalition region laid some groundwork for finding consensus on how to address the short- and long-term capacity issues of the highway.

In a facilitated process funded by CDOT, experts sorted through hundreds of comments to find four categories of interest:

- **BIG PICTURE PLANNING INTERESTS** cover statewide issues related to I-70. The time constraint of meeting projected traffic demand in 2025 was questioned, as was the \$4 billion dollar cap used by CDOT to eliminate some alternatives from consideration.
- **SOLVING INTEREST DEMANDS** address projected transportation demands within the corridor. There is not strong agreement whether solving the projected demand will be "good or bad for life in the corridor." But their was agreement that growth will continue regardless of improvements to I-70.
- **ALTERNATIVE INTERESTS** shows there is little agreement regarding any single specific alternative presented thus far. "It is impossible to determine a single preferred alternative from the community meetings," the facilitators summarized.
- **COMMUNITY MITIGATION INTERESTS** is "by far the loudest story," according to the report. The construction process itself was most often discussed in this category, with strong agreement that a 15-year construction period is too long.

Based on the stories generated by the community outreach meetings, the facilitators identified a need for:

- 1.) A transportation plan that is not unrealistically constrained, either financially, or by a defined planning window;
- 2.) A pplan to mitigate the expenses to communities caused by the increased transient populations passing through the community;
- 3.) A plan to develop transportation alternatives for the corridor;
- 4.) Procedures for addressing the long-term community mitigation interests on a sustainable basis.

---

[BACK](#) 