



I-70 FLOYD HILL PROJECT

Floyd Hill TT Meeting #22

SEPTEMBER 24, 2020 | 11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Meeting Summary TT Meeting #22

Welcome and Introductions

Jonathan Bartsch, CDR, convened the meeting with self-introductions of TT members. The meeting purpose was to review project updates, review the process for incorporating CSS documentation and input into NEPA, and review the Preliminary Preferred Alternative design graphics. There were no changes to the agenda.

Project Updates

I-70 Mountain Corridor projects:

- Greenway and CR 314 are moving forward. Construction is anticipated to begin in Summer 2021.
- Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels are being paved.
- Westbound PPSL / MEXL construction is on-schedule. Currently, there is sanitary sewer work in Idaho Springs and it will continue through the beginning of November 2020. Idaho Springs heavy civil work has also begun and includes grading work, parking lot work, and construction in the Exit 240 area. The schedule includes both day and night work.

Floyd Hill Contracting

- The Floyd Hill procurement process will begin Fall 2020 with the goal to onboard the contractor in the Spring or Summer of 2021.

Roles and Responsibilities of TT as related to the CSS and NEPA processes

Taber Ward, CDR Associates, reviewed the TT Charter language outlining the TT's purpose and role in the CSS process:

→ *“The purpose of the WB I-70 Floyd Hill NEPA Process (“WB I-70 Floyd Hill”) Technical Team (TT) is to ensure that local and agency contexts are defined and integrated as part of the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process.” The TT:*

- ◆ *Defines specific context of the segments and identify the specific critical issues, context considerations, technical, environmental and social/economic in a segment.*

- ◆ *Evaluates concepts and alternatives based on the critical issues, context considerations, and core values for the corridor and segment.*
- ◆ *Assists in developing alternatives and examines how different alternatives work and identifies trade-offs*
- ◆ *Assists in evaluating alternatives using Core Values and Evaluation Criteria developed by the PLT and TT.*

It was noted that the PLT’s role is to oversee and direct the CSS process, whereas the TT is composed of multi-disciplinary stakeholders and experts who ensure that local and agency contexts are defined and integrated as part of the CSS process. The TT members help to identify the specific critical issues, context considerations, technical, environmental and social/economic in a segment.

Moving forward, the PLT and TT meetings will be separate to ensure the PLT can focus on process oversight, and the TT can provide input on technical issues and context considerations.

CSS and NEPA

Vanessa Henderson, CDOT, outlined the relationship between the CSS and NEPA processes. These concurrent processes are separate, but complimentary. The CSS process assists CDOT/FHWA in the development of multiple Alternatives that are then evaluated by NEPA to recommend a Preferred Alternative. All of the work done in the PLT and TT meetings, including evaluation matrices, community input, CSS documentation, meeting notes, community considerations, and shared vision elements, are used in the NEPA process when evaluating Alternatives, and ultimately, recommending a Preferred Alternative.

Information from the CSS process will be put into the RFP documents and EA.

Amy Saxton noted that the goal of the CSS process is not to choose one Alternative over another. The goal is to help identify and develop multiple, well informed Alternatives that will be evaluated in NEPA. The PLT and TT members ensure that the Alternatives are as well-designed as possible, and consider the local context and community concerns, before they are evaluated by the NEPA process.

Cindy Neely also pointed out that the TT will help organize the CSS Commitment Tracking Sheet, and a PLT will continue to provide oversight and input into the process during the next CSS lifecycle phases.

NEPA Update

Vanessa shared that CDOT received the Floyd Hill EA on September 16, 2020 for review. The draft EA is pointing to the Canyon Viaduct as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative based on constructability, and fewer social and environmental impacts. The PLT and TT will be reviewing the Draft EA impacts during the October CSS meetings.

It is possible that the Preferred Alternative could change as NEPA continues through the review processes, which is why the Canyon Viaduct is, at this time, being called the Preliminary Preferred Alternative. When the EA is released in November, a Preferred Alternative will be identified. The Tunnel Alternative is not being eliminated because no fatal flaws have been identified. The Preferred Alternative decision will also depend on Contractor input.

Discussion

Q: Is the Tunnel Alternative with the south frontage road option being eliminated?

A: No; both frontage roads options will be evaluated in NEPA. The EA states that the south frontage road is a fatal flaw from the community perspective, but there are not fatal flaws from other environmental impact perspectives.

Q: Is there a formal document for the TT to review?

A: Yes; the EA will include technical reports and an assessment of the impacts of all the Alternatives. There will be a preview of these impacts at the next TT meeting in October. The TT can make additional comments through the public process once the EA is released.

Comment: Mike Raber, Clear Creek County Bicycle User Group, expressed his concerns about the Canyon Viaduct Alternative because of the potential debris that could fall from the roadway onto the Greenway corridor.

Response: These comments and impacts are being incorporated into the impact analysis process. There was a request to TT members for their specific suggestions on how to mitigate impacts.

Corridor Visualization

Tyler Larson, Atkins, shared 3D visuals of the Canyon Viaduct and walked the TT members through the corridor using (1) bird's eye view perspective, (2) I-70 driver perspective and (3) Greenway user perspective. The discussion and questions are captured below:

Q: How high is the bridge structure above the Creek?

A: The roadway is approximately 60-70 feet over the Creek crossings. This measurement is taken from the creek banks to the bridge structure.

Q: Would the Greenway trail on the south side of the Creek remain?

A: Yes.

Q: How does this impact AGS? Would the Canyon Viaduct Alternative impact AGS constructability, i.e. make AGS easier or harder to construct?

A: There is no difference in Alternatives re: constructability of AGS.

Comment: With climate change, there will be less snow and more rainfall. Water quality ponds need to be sized to consider erosion (rain erodes land more than snow). Consider volumes of erosion with soil ending up in sediment traps. In reviewing the draft impacts, it will be important to consider how the Alternatives compare re: run-off.

Comment: After the meeting, TT Member Steve Cook, DRCOG, e-mailed the Project Staff and suggested “unique site specific ITS type applications (especially real-time advanced upstream warnings; e.g. Ramp-Queue Back-up warnings, Wildlife warnings, Ice) on pavement in shady spots, etc...”

Hidden Valley Interchange Discussion and Highlights

- It was noted that this design is at 20%, and there are still details to work out at this interchange.
- The roundabouts are designed for tractor trailer use.
- The design currently lays out a curb and gutter along CR 314 with a 1-2 foot buffer from the Greenway Trail.
- It was noted that this intersection is very busy as it is currently designed to accommodate many scenarios and serve a variety of multi-modal interests.
 - Although the intersection requires a lot of complexity to accommodate different uses, it is not likely that all of the uses will be simultaneous and at high volumes (e.g. multiple trucks, bikers, and pedestrians all using the intersection at the same time).
 - Concern was expressed by TT members about the pedestrian-vehicle interaction at grade, especially in snow.
- There is a need to find design solutions that separate trucks and people.
- Currently, the signalized light is very long, and it is likely that similar back-ups and queues could continue to occur with this design.

Evaluation Matrix Discussion for the Central Section

Taber Ward introduced the Central Section Evaluation Matrix. She noted that the PLT directed that the TT would not make additional content changes on the Matrix, and there would be no color coding.

Amy Saxton, Clear Creek County, walked through the process of how she had updated the Central Section Matrix after TT Meeting #22. Her goal was not to change content, but to provide a timeline and record of TT/ITF/Project Staff conversations and input.

The Matrix will now go into the NEPA analysis. Applicable portions of the Matrix will be carried into the CSS Issues Tracking Sheet. It was also confirmed that there will be a CSS debrief and kick off meeting with the Contractor, once selected.

TT members requested one more opportunity to review the Matrix and add any final comments.

ACTION: CDR to send updated Evaluation Matrix to the TT.

Review CSS Issues Commitment Tracking Sheet

Taber Ward presented the CSS Issues Tracking Sheet to the TT for review. The purpose of the Tracking Sheet is to reconcile all of the CSS and community input documents (i.e. community considerations/critical issues, matrices, shared vision responsibilities) to track what we have agreed to design (or not to design) as part of the CSS and community engagement processes. The hope is to track both past and upcoming design commitments.

Q: Will the CSS Commitment Tracking Sheet be part of the contractor specs?

A: The CSS tracking sheet will be part of engineering design and the construction specs. The tracking sheet will translate to the final contract to track and follow CSS commitments through the next CSS Life Cycle.

Kelly Galardi, FHWA, noted in the chat box that “from a design standpoint CDOT is still the owner and they have full control over having these commitments being incorporated into the design. The contractor is there to propose ideas and innovations, not to take control of the design.”

Mandy Whorton, Peak Consulting, also noted in the chat box that “every mountain corridor contract must adhere to design and aesthetic guidelines and PEIS commitments.”

The TT requested that the CSS Tracking Sheet ITF meet in the next 6 to 8 weeks.

ACTION: CDR to coordinate CSS Tracking Sheet ITF in November.

Next Steps and Actions

- Virtual Public Engagement Planning with PLT
- TT Meeting in October
 - Review Draft NEPA Impacts
- CSS Tracking Sheet ITF

ACTION: CDR to send updated Evaluation Matrix to the TT.

ACTION: CDR to coordinate CSS Tracking Sheet ITF in November.

Attendees

John Muscatell, Bill Coffin (Floyd Hill Community), Margaret Bowes (I-70 Coalition), Gary Frey (Trout Unlimited), Mike Raber (Clear Creek County Bicycle Users Group), Tracy Sakaguchi (CMCA), Steve Durian (Jefferson County), Andy Marsh (Idaho Springs), Patrick Holinda (Bridge Enterprise), Kelly Galardi (FHWA), Stephen Strohming (Gilpin County), Lynnette Hailey (I-70)

Coalition and City of Black Hawk), Steve Cook (DRCOG), Holly Huyck (Upper Clear Creek Watershed Association), Mandy Whorton (Peak Consulting), Jonathan Bartsch, Taber Ward (CDR), Jon Altschuld (Chinook), Tyler Larson, Anthony Pisano (Atkins), Kevin Shanks (THK), Neil Ogden, Vanessa Henderson, Jeff Hampton, Maddie Cieciorca (CDOT).