



I-70 MOUNTAIN CORRIDOR

Floyd Hill PLT/TT Meeting #8

AUGUST 18, 2020 | 1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Floyd Hill NEPA

Meeting Summary PLT Meeting #8

Welcome and Agenda Review

Jonathan Bartsch, CDR, convened the meeting with self-introductions. Participants reviewed the agenda and no changes were made. The meeting purpose was to review project updates, review the Central Section Roadway Alternative Matrix, and discuss the CSS lifecycle phase.

Updates, Procurement, and Schedule

Neil Ogden, CDOT, presented updates on I-70 Mountain Corridor projects. Project updates included:

- The Silver Plume soundwall is complete. Initial feedback from stakeholders is supportive and CDOT is pleased with the high-quality construction.
- Greenway and CR 314 are moving forward. ROW acquisition is underway with construction anticipated in Summer 2021. A PLT/ITF was convened the week of August 10 to update key stakeholders on the project's status.
- Westbound PPSL / MEXL construction is on-schedule. Sanitary sewer work in Idaho Springs will begin the week of August 17 and continue through the first week of November 2020. Idaho Springs heavy civil work will begin on the Tuesday after the Labor Day long weekend, including the grading work, parking lot work, and construction in the Exit 240 area. The schedule includes both day and night work.

Q: What's the MEXL schedule status?

A: The schedule will largely depend on weather. However, it is possible that the contractor will make the no-excuse bonus.

Floyd Hill Contracting

Floyd Hill has received approval for final design and contractor procurement. The RFP will be developed over the next few months, with decisions and contracting within the next four to six months. The CSS Process will be transitioning into the next lifecycle. Emphasis will be placed on incorporating PLT/TT input into the contractor(s)'s final design phase.

Floyd Hill Funding

Despite broader economic stressors, funding for Floyd Hill remains promising. The project continues to be a statewide priority. The current effort is to find various sources to meet the goal of funding the entire project.

Q: Will this PLT/TT participate in proposal discussions for the eventual contractor?

A: In the past, CDOT has limited participation to groups with financial obligations and created observation spaces for invested stakeholders. These observers have been able to provide their preferences to CDOT. A similar effort will be made with the Floyd Hill contracting process.

Central Section Alternative Matrix Review

Jonathan introduced the Central Section Roadway Alternative Matrix (“Matrix”). The Matrix was substantially completed in Fall 2019. The three options, (1) Tunnel with North Frontage Road Alignment, (2) Tunnel with South Frontage Road Alignment, or (3) Canyon Viaduct, continue to be evaluated and tracked.

The TT in 2019 identified data-gaps and information requests for the Matrix. Mandy Whorton, Peak Consulting, highlighted the number of data-gaps in the Matrix and the areas where the TT provided comment to identify further information. Comments in the Matrix from the TT were recorded in red, and updates, based on the NEPA analyses, were tracked in blue.

Note: changes and edits to the document were made in real-time. Please see the Central Section Roadway Alternative Matrix, attached, for detailed discussion.

There was group discussion regarding the Matrix, as some stakeholders were not able to see the data in compressed Excel rows. The group agreed that today’s meeting would focus on discussions and issues, but not finalization, in order to provide the group additional time to work through the content offline.

Key discussion points and changes included:

- Discussions from ITFs related to emergency management and operations and maintenance should be included in the Matrix.
- An incident management plan will be developed during final design.
- The Matrix may need to be reorganized. Areas of discussion included the bulleted list in Column G, which serves as an overview of cell content, yet potentially misrepresents areas of significance and non-differentiators; as well as the need for a column with the PLT/TT summary.
- Color-coding may add value in clarifying, identifying, and documenting the PLT/TT’s preference, yet may also be confusing or misrepresent the preferred alternative.
- Emergency access will be informed by comments made by Kelly Galardi, FHWA, in a previous ITF.
- Hazmat discussions are challenging to determine at this level of analysis.
- Eastbound sun glare will be a challenge for all the alternatives.
- Cost is not represented in the differentiators. Anthony Pisano, Atkins, is working to develop cost estimates for the eastern sections of the alternatives and will have more information on construction and lifecycle costs soon.
- Evaluation should include local impacts in situations of heavy traffic or wildfires.

- Noise and environmental impacts to the Greenway and open space on the south side of the Creek for all alternatives should be recorded and measured as a differentiator.
- The relationship between alternatives and the corridor aesthetic guidelines should also be captured and evaluated.

ACTION: Taber Ward, CDR, to integrate ITF discussions into the Matrix.

Q: What is the purpose of the Matrix?

A: The purpose is to help distinguish between alternatives, and capture the sentiment of the inter-disciplinary PLT/TT. The matrix data will feed into the analysis of the preferred alternative. The Matrix will provide an accurate list of differences between the alternatives. It will ultimately inform the NEPA process and decisions made in NEPA.

Some members of the PLT/TT expressed concern regarding the relationship between the CSS process and the preferred alternative selection, as well as how the NEPA/Design elements are communicated to the contractor, particularly with the CMGC contracting method.

ACTION: CDR to send out a revised and simplified Matrix.

ACTION: CDR to schedule a September PLT/TT meeting.

ACTION: The PLT/TT to review and submit comments on the Matrix prior to the September PLT/TT meeting.

Next Steps and Action Items

Jonathan Bartsch concluded the meeting with a review of next steps and action items.

The meeting action items are:

- Taber Ward, CDR, to integrate ITF discussions into the Matrix.
- CDR to send out a revised and simplified Matrix.
- CDR to schedule a September PLT/TT meeting.
- The PLT/TT to review and submit comments on the Matrix prior to the September PLT/TT meeting.

Attendees

Neil Ogden, Tyler Brady, Vanessa Henderson, Jeff Hampton, Mike Keleman (CDOT); Mike Hillman (Idaho Springs); Amy Saxton, Cindy Neely (CCC); Patrick Holinda (Bridge Enterprise); Anthony Pisano (Atkins); Michael Raber (Clear Creek Bikeway User Group); Kevin Shanks (THK); Steve Durian (Jefferson County); Tracy Sakaguchi (CMCA); Mandy Whorton (Peak Consulting); Kelly Galardi (FHWA); John Muscatell (community); Bill Coffin (community); Rick Albers (law enforcement); Martha Tableman (Clear Creek Open Space); Jonathan Bartsch, Taber Ward, Emily Zmak (CDR Associates)