

# Meeting Notes



## I-70 Floyd Hill to Veterans Memorial Tunnels

**Date:** December 13, 2017

**Location:** CDOT – Golden

### **Technical Team - Meeting #5**

[Ctrl +Click HERE or paste link below into your browser for Shared Floyd Hill Project GDrive](#)

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B5g5iHKBVK6OR2tpb1JOOUNkNU0>

### **Introductions and Overview**

Taber Ward, CDR Associates, welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. Self-introductions followed. No changes were made to the agenda and the meeting proceeded.

#### **Outcomes from Meeting #4:**

- Discussed Draft Purpose and Need
- Agreed on Alternatives Evaluation Process
- Reviewed Context Consideration ITF Outcomes
- Reviewed CCC Greenway Trail Alignment
- Reviewed Alignment Concepts
  - Elimination of South and Off-Alignment Concepts
  - Move forward with North Alignment Concept with Design Options

### **Project Updates**

**WB I-70 PPSL** – Meeting on December 13, 2017. Focused on Idaho Springs Segment. Identified decision points and evaluation criteria for discussion at future meetings.

**Colorado Blvd** – Moving along with this project. It is on schedule, or slightly ahead of schedule. When finished, this project will be a great asset to the community.

**Bridge hit** – West of Empire Junction. No repairs needed to the bridge. The stiffener was impacted but the bearings are fine. Guard rail needs to be fixed. CDOT was complemented for good response time.

**Variable Speed Limit Concept of Operations and Development of Algorithm Project** – TT members suggested adding this project to the list of project updates. This project area is from Copper Mountain to C-470. The purpose of the project is to improve safety and travel reliability time. Ben Klein, CDOT, is leading the project.

**ACTION: THK** – Add Variable Speed Limit Concept of Operations and Development of Algorithm Project to project list on PowerPoint

### Technical Team Schedule

Anthony Pisano, ATKINS, reviewed the TT schedule and discussed the issues and when those will be discussed and evaluated. The TT is asked to review the schedule and provide comments/feedback.

**ACTION: CDR** - Add updated TT schedule to the [GDrive](#)

### Refined Purpose and Need

Carrie Wallis, ATKINS, presented the updated Floyd Hill Draft Purpose and Need Statement alongside the 2011 PEIS Purpose and Need Document. Since this is a Tier 2 project, it needs to reflect the same basic purpose and need as was developed for the Tier 1 PEIS Purpose and Need.

#### TT comments to draft P&N:

- The word “should” – can we change this to “will” or “shall?”
  - It is difficult to change the word “should” as the NEPA documentation needs to balance different components of the project, i.e. environment, recreation, historic, mobility, engineering. “Should” is therefore a more accurate term to use to describe this balancing act.
- The P&N should address the needs to “mitigate” and “repair/restore” damage. This was the spirit of the 2011 PEIS. There is a need to focus on more than just “enhancing” the corridor.

**ACTION: Technical Team** - Review and comment on the P&N by January 3rd.

**ACTION: ATKINS** – Provide an updated P&N Draft at January 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### ITF Outcomes – Context Considerations

Kevin Shanks, THK Associates, outlined the Context Considerations and the discussion from the December 7 ITF. Kevin distributed a handout to the TT that went through the current work of the ITF.

The ITF is continuing to develop measures of success – the idea is to look for measures that are quantifiable. The measures of success cannot be so specific that they point to one alternative/answer.

The “Category” column will be our updated “Critical Issues” in the CSS flow Chart.

#### **TT Comments:**

- The public will need a chance to review the final Context Considerations Chart so they can see how their comments are addressed.
  - The Chart will be available on the website. An email will be sent out with Project information, including the website and a link to the Context Considerations Chart, for public review and comment.
- Idaho Springs would like to look closely at the chain down areas – important to coordinate this with WB PPSL; Idaho Springs has some thoughts.
- Idaho Springs would like to look closely at a proposal for a Bustang Park n’ Ride in the vicinity of the Veterans Memorial Tunnels. This is also connected to the WB PPSL project and specific plans in Idaho Springs.

**ACTION: Technical Team** - send comments and feedback, specifically around evaluation questions and measures of success to Taber by Tuesday, December 19. The ITF can then discuss any input received at their meeting on Dec 20.

#### **Coordination Efforts**

Anthony Pisano, ATKINS, provided an update on stakeholder coordination efforts including:

Met with Clear Creek Rafting Company and the property owners of Two Bears Restaurant. Summaries are forthcoming. Setting up a meeting with Cassandra Patton, CCC Tourism Bureau, to check in on small business issues and tourism perspective.

The mill sites and historic work with Christine Bradley will be handled through the Section 106 ITF.

Tim Mauck is assisting with GIS and coordinating/collecting CCC’s information.

Still working on getting ahold of CCC and Evergreen fire departments. Suggestion to go to Fire Board meeting – these are open to the public.

**ACTION:** Steve Harelson to send Anthony Kelly Babeon’s phone number.

#### **Map Exercise - Interchange Review**

Anthony Pisano, ATKINS, reviewed current and future traffic volumes in relation to the proposed Concept Development Process Interchange scenarios (3D versions). The traffic numbers are being updated right now with more recent volumes. The goal of the presentation is to get feedback from the TT on current movements, desired movements, what is missing from designs, and what else the design team should be considering.

#### **TT Discussion:**

- In addition to traffic volumes, it will be important to look at the mix of traffic, i.e. trucks, cars, trailers, etc -- this impacts how roads and interchanges should be designed.
- CR 65 interchange with I-70 was discussed. a lot of traffic coming up US 40 from US 6 and US 6/119. The team will investigate left turn movements on the CR 65 bridge to EB I-70. Atkins will be collecting Origin/Destination information.
  - Do we need to widen bridge for left hand movements?
  - CR 65 also moves people into Evergreen.
- If there is an EB on-ramp added to the interchange at the bottom of FH – this may reduce the traffic getting on I-70 at the top of the hill. Consider adding or moving ramps at the CR 65 intersection.
- Need to consider gaming traffic and grades. US 40 is steeper than I-70. There is a traffic mix of trucks, RVs, horses, bicycles, etc.
- EB US 6 – consider the Frei truck traffic.
- Concern about a roundabout at top of FH. The grades and conditions could be a challenge for commercial vehicles coming to a stop, especially in winter. This will be addressed during the preliminary design phase.
- Generally, the WB ramp at US 6 is very low volume (one car every two minutes). This is true until there is an accident on I-70 or just heavy traffic on Saturday mornings.
  - **TT suggestion** – Where US 6 and US 40 meet – consider a roundabout to handle left hand turning movements and encourage truckers to get on I-70 using a bypass lane. If a new EB entrance ramp is added at the bottom of Floyd Hill, the by-pass lane could help encourage truckers to use the new ramp instead of going up US 40 to CR 65. Lots of the larger rigs take the canyon because grades, fuel and breaks. Problem is that there are so few roads – if we close them, it will really mess the whole system up.
- The high school track team runs a circle across CR 65, WB along US 40 and back along Homestead as part of their training – need to make sure pedestrian access is safe.

- CR 65/ US 40 – There are steep grades in the EB direction and vehicles speed though. There is also limited sight distance.
- FHWA suggests that it would be helpful to have existing crash information on these interchange areas. We should stay open to the range of options, but use the crash data to help with design and decision making. Should not rely solely on traffic counts since some changes potentially change the traffic patterns.
  - Half diamond interchanges – not favored by FHWA.
- There is a planned change for the Martee building nearby acreage just north of the interchange. Monarch Casino bought this land. It will be used as a truck staging and distribution center for a new 25 floor casino in Black Hawk.
- The team also needs to consider the 500 unit condo development being considered by Clear Creek County – for the top of Floyd Hill.
- Growth is going so fast; how do we dovetail our plans and solutions? We don't want to create a solution just to have it reach capacity right away.
  - The engineering plans will be looking 20-30 years out.
- Hidden Valley interchange – The team will investigate alternatives that continue the lanes on US 6 traffic to the Hidden Valley interchange along a new frontage road that will connect to CR 314. A roundabout intersection would be constructed to connect the new frontage road at the interchange. We anticipate that a roundabout will have sufficient capacity to accommodate the 2040 traffic volumes. The roundabout would also accommodate U-turns for the Central City Parkway when I-70 is closed. The Bell property is zoned commercial, so there could be future development.
- Need to consider emergency egress for Floyd Hill (could impact private roads on both Jefferson County and CCC).
- Crash data will be very important – Are there crashes and are they caused by the grades or the speed differential. A 3<sup>rd</sup> lane could solve the differential speed limit. Need to get the traffic mixes working better – this will impact the recreation area at the top.

### Near Term Next Steps

- ITF Meeting on December 20 to continue working on Critical Issues (Categories); Measures of Success and Evaluation Questions
- Refine North Alternative alignment design options.
- Refine interchange concept design and begin to look at how they can be realistically combined with the alignments.

- TT and Project Staff to finish developing general and specific evaluation criteria for alignments and interchanges.
- Level 1 Screening of North Alternative alignment design options and interchanges (qualitative)
- Level 2 Screening combined alignment design options and interchanges (quantitative) – new traffic information will be used here.

## Actions and Agreements

**ACTION: THK** – Add Variable Speed Limit Concept of Operations and Development of Algorithm Project to project list on PowerPoint

**ACTION: Technical Team** - Review and comment on the P&N by January 3rd.

**ACTION: ATKINS** – Provide an updated P&N Draft at January 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**ACTION: Technical Team** - send comments and feedback, specifically around evaluation questions and measures of success to Taber by Tuesday, December 19. The ITF can then discuss any input received at their meeting on Dec 20.

**ACTION:** Steve Harelson to send Anthony Kelly Babeon's phone number.

## Attendees

Andrew Marsh (Idaho Springs); Carol Kruse, Scott Haas (USFS); Randy Wheelock, Jo Ann Sorensen (Clear Creek County); Bill Coffin, John Muscatell (Community Reps from Floyd Hill); Lynette Hailey (I-70 Coalition); Wendy Koch (Town of Empire); Steve Durian (Jefferson County); Sam Hoover (Central City); Mike Raber (CC Bikeway User Group); Gary Frey (Trout Unlimited); Daniel Horn (Gilpin County); Tracy Sakaguchi (CMCA); Holly Huyck (CC Watershed Foundation), Martha Tabelman (CCC Open Space); Kelly Gilardi (FHWA); Patrick Holinda (CDOT Bridge Enterprise); Anthony Pisano, Carrie Wallis, Tyler Larson (Atkins); Gina McAfee (HDR Inc.); Kevin Shanks (THK Associates); Neil Ogden, Stephen Harelson, Kevin Brown, Stacia Sellers (CDOT); Taber Ward, Jonathan Bartsch (CDR Associates)