



Floyd Hill - TT Meeting Summary
Dec 5th, 2019, 1 PM to 4 PM
CDOT Golden - Lookout Mountain Conference Room

Welcome and Introductions

Jonathan Bartsch, CDR Associates, welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. Self-introductions followed.

Corridor Project Updates

WB I-70 Mountain Express Lane: Two lanes have remained open during construction to reduce congestion and ensure the mobility of the travelling public. There was a rockslide over Thanksgiving, and this slowed traffic down. Jeff Hampton (CDOT) is working with the contractor to ensure the rockslide is cleaned up and construction work can progress as scheduled. The geotechnical team has been mobilized. The rockslide was an unforeseen event and not part of construction work.

TT Comment: The public information around the rockslide and its impact is going really well.

TT Question: How will the rockslide impact the construction schedule, what are the near-term next steps for rock work?

CDOT Response: Starting Wednesday, Dec. 4, CDOT will conduct rockfall mitigation work to prevent rockslides on westbound I-70 near Idaho Springs. Traffic will be periodically stopped in both directions between the hours of 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. this Wednesday and Thursday and the following Mondays through Thursdays the weeks of Dec. 9 and Dec. 16. Work will begin near MP 239 on the west end of Idaho Springs and continue through the next few weeks. This section was planned for rockfall mitigation in spring of 2020. Due to the early snow storms and extra moisture this fall, the scaling will be moved up, and done as soon as possible to prevent possible rock slides. On Monday, Dec. 9, crews will also scale and drill the rock face next to westbound I-70 near Mile Point 236, just east of Dumont. This is the location of rockslides last week. This work will be done in preparation of blasting scheduled for Dec. 18. When blasting occurs, I-70 will be closed in BOTH directions in this location for a few hours. This work will be done as soon as possible to stabilize the rock face.

TT comment: The 2-3 hours of closure so close to Christmas will be tough for local business.

CDOT Response: There is a risk of waiting, the rock face needs to be stabilized as soon as possible. We will also be working with Clear Creek School District to coordinate with school bus timing and road closures.

Silver Plume Sound Wall: The sound wall is down. 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.

Vail Pass: The Environmental Assessment Draft is expected in March. A PLT was held on December 3.

BUILD GRANT: CDOT did not get the BUILD grant for the I-70 Truck Escape Ramp Projects; will look at a targeted grants regarding freight in the next INFRA round.

HPTE Funding: There will be a separate PLT for the Floyd Hill Funding Gap Study. It will be important to have full membership of all interested I-70 stakeholders, not just those proximate to Floyd Hill.

West Program Engineer hired: Mike Keleman was selected for this position. He was the Project Engineer on Twin Tunnels.

ITF Report Out: Central Section Canyon Viaduct and Tunnel Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

CDR handed out copies of the Central Section Canyon Viaduct and Tunnel Alternatives Evaluation Matrix with an associated “Data Needs” document to track the items that need further research, analysis and evaluation. The next step is to begin collecting this data and ensure that TT questions are answered. Data findings will be put into the Evaluation Matrix.

The Evaluation Matrix will feed into NEPA to document the PLT/TT input received during the CSS process. The CSS chapter in NEPA will discuss and summarize the TT and ITF meeting outcomes.

TT Question: The TT is charged with making an evaluation and indicating preference for the various alternatives. When this Evaluation Matrix is fully populated, will it be run as an Evaluation, i.e. fill in with “fair,” “better,” “best” coloring?

CDOT Answer: Yes. We will use this as an Evaluation and color the Matrix before Summer 2020. Most of the questions in the Matrix are also in NEPA.

CSS and Project Delivery Methods and Process

There are two potential alternative delivery methods that would be used for this project. These methods and how they work with the CSS process are described below:

CMGC Delivery Method: The Contractors and CSS participants work together through the final design process prior to construction.

Design-Build: Would need to set up a process before the selection process to determine how CSS fits in. There would be a process to align the specs and develop a contract that would meet the needs of the project and still leave room for contractor innovation. The contractors would need approval to change the more prescriptive elements of the design. This would involve a new PLT since it is a different Life Cycle in the CSS Process (i.e. Design phase, procurement phase, construction phase).

TT Question: How can we be assured that what we have been talking about for the last two years is included in the procurement process? We do not want to shut out the PLT/TT or community stakeholders from the procurement process. How can we bring the contractor, tester, designer, owner's rep on early enough to ensure they understand where we are coming from?

TT Comment: We need to make a decision, as soon as possible, about who the consultants will be: owner, designer, tester, contractor, etc. What will CDOT's oversight be once the project goes out construction? The sooner we can bring people on, the better.

CDOT Comment: We will look into procurement options and delivery method. There is a CDOT/FHWA Team that will make the final selection and delivery method. The CSS stakeholders will be engaged in developing the contract requirements.

TT Comment: We need a guidebook on how the different processes work in CSS. How do we transition and what is the stakeholder role in Concept, Design, Procurement, Construction, Maintenance, etc.?

CDOT Answer: There is a framework already in place for the different phases of the project. These would require further development once a delivery method is chosen.

Floyd Hill Project Goals Discussion

CDR handed out a Floyd Hill Project Goals document to the TT members. The purpose of the Goals document is to aid in selecting the project delivery method. These are project-specific goals that were established in 2017, prior to the 109 and 110 Ballot measures and the associated project delivery selection matrix.

The Goal list was specifically generated for procurement purposes, it was not generated by PLT.

TT suggestion: The goals should be followed by strategies and a workplan. The goals need to be more project-specific, not general. More specificity around goals (i.e. quantifiable)

TT Comment: The Matrix talks about Recommendations from SWEEP and ALIVE. Both of these committees must maintain and enhance environmental quality. This should be captured in the Environmental "implied goal"

TT Comment: The Goals should not be contingent on funding.

ACTION: Project Staff will review Clear Creek County's Resolution and Concept Development Process to see if these documents contain additional goals that should be integrated into the Floyd Hill Project Goals document for procurement.

ACTION: Project Staff to revise Project Goals by early 2020.

TT ACTION: Once Project Staff revises goals, the TT will provide input into the Goals document so the right decision can be made during project delivery.

CSS Schedule and Next Steps

- ~~Develop and Refine EA Alternatives: September – December 2019~~
 - ~~September TT Mtg – Introduce / review Canyon Viaduct Alternative~~
 - ~~October TT Mtg – Review Tunnel Alternative refinements, including Frontage Road alignment~~
 - ~~November & December TT Mtgs – Refine and review alternatives for NEPA analysis~~
- **Environmental Assessment (EA) Impact Analysis: Winter/Spring 2020**
 - January 9th ALIVE ITF - Project Update and Mitigation Discussions
 - January Greenway and Traffic/Incident Management ITFs
 - Early February PLT Meeting - Public meeting preparation
 - Spring 2020 Section 106 and SWEEP ITFs - Project Update, Effects Information (Section 106), and Mitigation Discussions
- **Public Meeting: February 2020 (Project updates, next steps, and NEPA Alternatives)**
 - March PLT/TT - Follow up from Public Meeting
- **EA Preparation: Summer 2020**
 - Summer TT (1-2 Meetings) - Review preliminary impacts and mitigation and finalize CSS Matrix documentation.
- **EA Public Comment Period and Public Hearing: Fall 2020**
 - Fall PLT - Public hearing preparation
- **NEPA Completion (pending funding availability): Winter 2021**
 - Winter PLT/TT - Follow up from Public Comment Period and Public Hearing, Wrap up Life Cycle Phase 3 (Project Design) and Transition to Life Cycle Phase 4 (Project Construction)

ACTION: CDR to cancel the December 17, 2019 TT Meeting.

Greenway Discussion

The TT discussed the Clear Creek Greenway Corridor and looked over Greenway maps provided by Clear Creek County.

Clear Creek County provided a list of potential issues and concerns as related to the Central Section highway improvements and the Greenway:

- **ACCESS:**
 - Access above a trail and below a trail. Clear Creek County does not want a trail as a single line surrounded by concrete walls.
 - Must consider wildlife access from above and below the trail.
 - Need to ensure Emergency Services egress. The trail should allow EMS to access the trail and enough space to work.
 - Access to activity nodes, including fishing, rafting, hiking area, and cycling.
 - The design should not preclude an eventual connection, at least for pedestrians and walking traffic, to Clear Creek Road. Clear Creek Road is a road up in the Saddleback Subdivision which is south and uphill from Clear Creek.
- **VIADUCT CONCERNS:**
 - Shadowing
 - Noise
 - Traffic and types of vehicles
- **DESIGN:**
 - Trailheads need parking. Even if CDOT isn't building the parking, need to ensure space is allocated.
 - Trail needs to get through the US 6 and HV interchanges

CDOT Question: Is the trail alignment shown across from Two Bears the final Greenway alignment, or is there potential for variation?

Answer: There is some room for variation. E.g. Need to get back to the south side of the creek, the creek crossing has not yet been determined. Hwy 6 and Hwy 40 areas have not been determined. The recreational trail system shown on the map is proposed, not existing.

Clear Creek County Comment: Ultimately, the Greenway Corridor is a recreational asset that CCC hopes to realize. Certain highway alternatives would preclude Clear Creek County from using this system as an asset. Many of these lands are Open Space properties that were purchased with dollars that require additional visibility in the community and we are required to use funds in a certain way. There are some limits on how that land gets used. If this land is sold, the fund must be compensated.

CDOT Question: For the parking areas indicated, do you have a number of spaces?

Answer: No. This is an initial vision - as alternatives get refined, there may be other opportunities. The goal is to ensure that the Greenway works and is included in the

different alternatives. The design of Greenway needs to evolve with alternatives design.

ACTION: Defer the Greenway ITF conversation until design is further advanced.

ACTION: CCC to send electronic version of the maps to CDOT.

Action Items

ACTION: Project Staff will review Clear Creek County's Resolution and Concept Development Process to see if these documents contain additional goals that should be integrated into the Floyd Hill Project Goals document for procurement.

ACTION: Project Staff to revise Project Goals by early 2020.

TT ACTION: Once Project Staff revises goals, the TT will provide input into the Goals document so the right decision can be made during project delivery.

ACTION: CDR to cancel the December 17, 2019 TT Meeting.

ACTION: Defer the Greenway ITF conversation until design is further advanced.

ACTION: CCC to send electronic version of the maps to CDOT.

Attendees

Amy Saxton, Cindy Neely (Clear Creek County); Tracy Sakaguchi (CMCA); Martha Tableman (CCC Open Space); Sam Hoover (Central City); Bill Coffin, John Muscatell (Floyd Hill Community); Mike Hillman, Andy Marsh (Idaho Springs); Steve Durian (Jefferson County); Mike Raber (CC Bikeway Users Group); Gary Frey (Trout Unlimited); Vanessa Henderson (phone), Tyler Brady, Neil Ogden, Jeff Hampton, Kevin Brown (CDOT); Anthony Pisano (Atkins); Patrick Holinda (Bridge Enterprise); Kevin Shanks (THK); Taber Ward, Jonathan Bartsch (CDR)