



Floyd Hill - TT Meeting Summary

Nov 12th, 2019, 1 PM to 4 PM

Postponed from Oct. 29, 2019 due to weather.

CDOT Golden - Lookout Mountain Conference Room

Welcome and Introductions

Taber Ward, CDR Associates, welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. Self-introductions followed.

Corridor Project Updates

Neil Ogden, CDOT, updated the group on corridor-wide projects. Neil also noted that Steve Harelson, CDOT, has been promoted to Chief Engineer for CDOT and is no longer at Region 1.

Floyd Hill: The Transportation Commission is reviewing potential funding sources for the Floyd Hill modifications. Final approval for up to \$100 million is in December (note that it was actually approved on November 21st). The Bridge Enterprise Program is also anticipated to bring resources to the table, and the collective group is looking at federal grant opportunities and funding options over the next year.

WB I-70 Mountain Express Lane: Construction is underway, including conduit installation and west-end widening.

Fall River Road Bridge: The project is nearing completion and will open to traffic around December 20th.

Silver Plume Sound Wall: The wall is being removed. The project will pause around Thanksgiving and resume work in early winter. Completion is anticipated in June 2020.

CR 314/Greenway: CDOT has completed about 30% design on both of these WB I-70 Mountain Express Lanes INFRA companion projects and anticipates starting construction in Spring 2021. There is budget available for both projects.

Q: What are the endpoints of the Greenway design?

A: As part of the Greenway project, the East Idaho Springs section begins at Exit 241 and continues to the east, ending at the RV storage yard. The Dumont Trailhead will also be constructed as part of the Greenway project. In addition, another section between the Dumont Trailhead and the Animal Shelter is being considered. As part of the CR 314 project, the Greenway will be completed between the RV storage yard on the west to the Game Check Trailhead.

Vail Pass: The EA documentation has begun and a PLT meeting is scheduled for December 3, 2019.

HPTE Funding: A subcommittee of the Collaborative Effort has been formed to look at options for the funding gap for Floyd Hill. HPTE released a Request for Proposals for a “Floyd Hill Project Funding Gap Study” on November 15th. This process will be completed parallel to the NEPA process, will help inform project development, and is anticipated to be an eight month process.

Action Item Follow Up

Taber Ward prompted updates on outstanding action items from TT #17 meeting.

Anthony Pisano, Atkins, addressed the action item to look into truck turn-arounds at Hidden Valley. This action item stemmed from concern that, if US 6 is closed, semi-trucks would have no option to turn around to go eastbound. Atkins ran truck-turning templates and found that a truck turn-around is possible, albeit tight.

Group discussion followed about concerns about tipping loads and right-hand U-turns for freight. Atkins emphasized that the U-turn option is for emergencies when US 6 has been closed.

Neil Ogden, CDOT, also updated the TT on his research around percentage of overheight, overweight trucks in the corridor. It was found that there is a total of approximately 600 overweight/overheight vehicles that are permitted on I-70 in the westbound direction each year.

NEPA Process

Vanessa Henderson, CDOT, provided a handout to the TT and gave an update on the NEPA process.

There are three NEPA Alternatives:

1. **No Action Alternative** - evaluates routine maintenance projects only, including replacing the bridge at the bottom of Floyd Hill as is, and is used as a baseline for comparison of alternatives.
2. **Tunnel Alternative** - evaluates putting WB I-70 into a tunnel with two frontage road design options, one on the north side of Clear Creek and one on the south side.
3. **Canyon Viaduct Alternative** - evaluates putting both EB and WB I-70 on a viaduct .

Both the Tunnel and Canyon Viaduct Alternatives include the Frontage Road and Greenway. The differences between the alternatives is only between the US 6 and Hidden Valley interchanges, which is being called the Central Section. They both affect the US 6 interchange in the same way.

Q: Does the Canyon Viaduct Alternative have north and south Frontage Road options?

A: No. The Viaduct Alternative provides more room through the canyon than the Tunnel Alternative, so the Frontage Road would remain on the north side of the Creek.

Q: Will both the north and south Frontage Road options in the Tunnel Alternative be analyzed in NEPA?

A: Yes, both alternatives will be evaluated as part of the NEPA process. NEPA will produce more quantitative data, so it is important to carry both options forward for an objective evaluation.

Q: The “frontage road” in the Tunnel Alternative is an extension of US 6. It seems to be a misnomer, as a highway gets much more traffic than a frontage road.

A: A frontage road is a broad term indicating a subsidiary road running parallel to a main road or highway and giving access to houses and businesses.

The draft NEPA schedule provided to the TT has the following timelines:

- Sept. - Dec. 2019 (current): develop and refine NEPA alternatives
- Winter / Spring 2020: NEPA impact analysis
- February 2020: Public meeting on project status, next steps, and NEPA alternatives
- Summer 2020: Environmental Assessment (EA) preparation
- Fall 2020: EA public comment period and public hearing
- Fall / Winter 2020: NEPA completion, pending funding availability

Taber provided the group a second handout, in draft form, that provided a high-level overview of the Alternatives and Design Options and summarized the meetings and matrices. The group committed to reviewing and providing feedback on the language.

ACTION: TT to review Central Alignment Alternatives Review and provide feedback to CDOT.

- Recommended change: “Both frontage road design options affect the US 6 interchange in the same way.”

Q: Does the south frontage road option provide vehicle access to the creek?

A: It would be possible to drive on the Greenway in an emergency to access the creek with the south frontage road option, but it would not allow vehicles access to the creek any other time.

Alternatives Discussion and Review

Anthony Pisano provided a detailed overview of the Tunnel Alternative with the north and south frontage road options and the Canyon Viaduct Alternative.

Tunnel Alternative with North Frontage Road Option

Q: Are there four lanes on the EB side between the bottom of Floyd Hill and the Hyland Hills Exit?

A: There will be three general purpose lanes as there are today plus an auxiliary lane connecting the new US 6 to EB I-70 entrance ramp and the Hyland Hills exit ramp.

Q: Has there been a decision about where the auxiliary lane ends?

A: This is being evaluated during the NEPA process. At TT meeting #18, there was a suggestion to extend the lane past the ramp. This option will be considered.

Q: How hard would it be for a large semi-truck to get from US 6 to I-70 EB at Hidden Valley?

A: The new design does not require trucks to use Hidden Valley, but it is possible for a truck to make a U-turn at the existing CR 314 intersection. This would require trucks on WB US 6 to remain on the Frontage Road, drive past the new flyover ramp and go through the Hidden Valley Interchange at the intersection with CR 314. Trucks could then make a U-turn onto the EB I-70 entrance ramp.

Q: What is the hazmat re-route for truckers? What movements will drivers need to make in the Hidden Valley interchange?

A: This question will be explored in further depth once more information is known about the design.

Q: There is a retaining wall along the south side of I-70 (north side of Clear Creek) between the Veterans Memorial Tunnels and the Hidden Valley interchange. Both Alternatives will relocate approximately 1,200 ft of the creek in this area. How much of the retaining wall on the north side of the creek would be impacted.?

A: The majority of the retaining wall would be removed / replaced.

Tunnel Alternative with S. Frontage Road Option

Q: Is moving the Greenway closer to the creek putting it at risk of flooding?

A: The Greenway will remain in its current location; the road will be moved up the slope. Vertical separation varies between 5 feet to 20 feet. The project will follow the design standards to keep the Greenway above the 10-year floodplain elevation.

Q: How do wildlife travel to get to the creek? Do animals travel on the south side?

A: This will be examined in NEPA and in the upcoming ALIVE ITFs.

Q: Do any of the Alternatives impact the mitigation work done for Clear Creek as part of the Twin Tunnels Project?

A: No, the Alternatives do not impact the mitigation work built. All mitigation work is upstream of this project. In fact, this could be an opportunity to continue the improvements made from that effort and it will be considered further during the NEPA process.

Canyon Viaduct Alternative

Q: Does this Alternative address the curve issues of the highway?

A: Yes this alternative will also flatten the highway curves.

Q: What is the elevation change for the viaduct?

A: The elevation change is a minimum of 30' above I-70.

Q: Would Eastbound lanes remain in the current EB footprint until the viaduct was complete?

A: Correct. Once construction is completed, CDOT would have the option of moving westbound traffic to the new lanes on the viaduct, or moving both eastbound and westbound traffic head to head on the new WB bridge structure while reconstructing the current highway.

Q: Are there planned rock cuts at WB US 6?

A: No, the road hugs the curves of the existing rock cut.

Other Items

The group discussed what information would be helpful for analyzing the Alternatives at the next meeting.

The TT asked to review the CSS Flow Chart, critical issues and the criteria matrices.

The TT also asked for general information on differentiators between the Alternatives, including bridges, height and length of rock cut, and creek crossings.

ACTION: Atkins to develop general information on each Alternative and quantify key variables.

ACTION: Atkins to print roll plots for each Alternative and bring to the ITF.

There was group discussion on the Tunnel vs. Viaduct matrix, which will be modified to reflect comparisons between the Alternatives. The TT agreed that the Project Team would develop a first draft of the matrix, to facilitate the ITF's discussions and edits to the document.

ACTION: Project Team to create first draft of matrix, including identification of what does not change (i.e. non-differentiators) between alternatives.

ACTION: The TT to review final CSS Flow Chart and Context Considerations before the ITF.

The goal of the Evaluation Matrix is not to provide a recommendation, but rather to fully document the TT discussion to carry forward into NEPA.

Action Items

- TT to review Central Alignment Alternatives Review and provide feedback to CDOT.
- Atkins to develop statistics on each Alternative and quantify key variables.
- Atkins to print roll plots for each Alternative and bring to ITF.

- Project Team to create first draft of matrix, including identification of what does not change (i.e. non-differentiators) between alternatives.
- The TT to review final CSS Flow Chart and Context Considerations before the next ITF and bring feedback.

Attendees:

Amy Saxton, Cindy Neely (Clear Creek County); Tracy Sakaguchi (CMCA); Martha Tableman (CCC Open Space); Sam Hoover (Central City); Bill Coffin (Floyd Hill Community); Holly Huyck; Gary Frey (Trout Unlimited); Lynette Hailey (I-70 Coalition); Vanessa Henderson, Tyler Brady, Neil Ogden, Jeff Hampton, Kevin Brown (CDOT); Tyler Larson, Anthony Pisano (Atkins); Mandy Whorton (Peak Consulting); Patrick Holinda (Bridge Enterprise); Kevin Shanks (THK); Taber Ward, Emily Zmak (CDR); Kelly Galardi (FHWA)