



PROJECT:	I-70 Frontage Road Improvement (Old US 40/CR 314)
PURPOSE:	PLT/TT #2
DATE/TIME HELD:	October 26, 2011: 9:45 am – 12:30pm
LOCATION:	Idaho Springs City Hall – 1711 Miner Street, Idaho Springs, CO
Attendees:	See sign in sheet (snow conditions, lower attendance)

Meeting Minutes

1. New introductions

- John Rice – Clear Creek Rafting Company
- Bill Spies – Town of Empire
- Smaller group due to weather. Will host a PLT 2.5 Nov.1, 2011.

2. Updates

- a. Process overview – Mary Jane Loevlie noted concerns that the Cat Ex would not fully cover all resources
- b. Twin Tunnels open house comments
- c. Frontage Road website

<http://www.coloradodot.info/projects/i70frontageroad-idahosprings>

- Will include presentations, minutes, newsletters, etc.

d. Greenway refinement process

- Need to establish property owner/ CCC Greenway/IS/CDOT coordination meeting to define opportunities and challenges for the Greenway project.
- In western decision area, Tim Mauck noted that the Greenway Plan showed the trail relocated on private access road closer to Clear Creek. Part of longer range vision.
- Greenway trail questions/discussions
 - Limit traffic /bike/ped interactions
 - Game Check section could be good trailhead and picnic area
 - Where CDOT owns ROW that rafters use for access: locate existing and then look for opportunities for safer bus parking, designated access points. Statewide issue, CDOT not likely to want to permit take-offs permit
 - City and County permit rafting access and would want to be in conversation.



- Gravel Road can accommodate most traffic, but John Rice had 3 busses slip off dirt section; now only allows his busses to go in and out one way.
- Remove access by doghouse bridge and move it up near sewer treatment plant and maybe one near Hidden Valley

e. Budget and GOCO grant opportunities

Tim Mauck identified multiple grant opportunities to complete the Greenway Trail

- GOCO \$18 M funds, very competitive 62 communities, selected applicants will be invited to a December mtg
- Feb/March – local commission will apply for another grant that requires a match
- In past, CDOT partnered with CCC to use the CDOT construction funds as contribution “match”
- Fishing is fun – potential DOW funds for stream enhancement.

f. Relocates and water/sewer plans

- Les has provided utility plans. Team is looking how to integrate.
- Will have some utility relocates. Xcel is aware of this project – Dave Rubel of CDOT has been reaching out to Xcel. Good opportunity for partnering. What are the Idaho Springs and Clear Creek County plan to extend? Opportunities for public and private funding to extend utilities. Ben’s recommendation is to get property owners to get together and come up with cost estimates. Develop a potential utility ITF.

g. Doghouse rail bridge sufficiency

- Not sufficient for I-70 traffic loads at this time. Would need retrofit from a structural level. Can accommodate regular frontage road with load limit signing.

h. General discussion of Phase I and Phase II

- What is the best way to invest CDOT’s money now that will benefit all partners and support future plans? Team will continue working with PLT to determine.
- Where does the bike trail go during construction including the TT EA detour – first priority is safety. Looking at alternate needs to transport during construction (could shuttle) can also Special event permit application – can shut down construction for major bike events. This can be incorporated in to construction specifications.

3. Project Work Plan and Public Information Plan review



- Project Work Plan and PI Plan are consistent with CSS and PEIS process and very similar to Twin Tunnels EA process. Has been emailed out for your review and comment. Need PLT endorsement from larger group.
 - Context Statement: will finalize with larger group
 - Desired Outcomes – will finalize with larger group. Phase 1 goal is to get as much as we can under construction this summer and are working with PLT to define those immediate improvements.
 - Issue Task Force – setting up one for the Greenway. We are combined with Twin Tunnels EA ITF for SWEEP, ALIVE, Section 106. Utilities may need an Issue Task Force
4. Establish screening criteria
- Emailed criteria to PLT/TT– will request comment and discussion concerns prior to rescheduled meeting.
 - Began with Idaho Spring ASA and revised based on Frontage Road
 - Traffic and air quality discussion – more information to be provided at rescheduled meeting.
5. Review cross section options and “decision areas”
- General description of cross sections
 - Cross Section C - Cantilever – potential stream impacts and different costs for different vehicle loads
 - Section D – rock wall, consistent with aesthetics, drainage with inlets along hill side
6. Western Decision Areas discussion:
- Preference for cross section B (with greenway on south side) from east terminus to Lancaster trail and again at crossing to new trail. This would connect to the trail at the ballpark. Cross section A is okay for the rest of western area where the trail already occurs.
 - What opportunity do we have to cross the trail at the western boat access to connect to a future creekside greenway trail?
 - Impacts to Forest Service property with Cross Section B
 - Bill’s question: During construction, what will CDOT maintenance do during the winter for snow removal? Ben: We will engage CDOT maintenance experts at the FIR and FOR meetings to better answer this.
7. Gravel road / Doghouse area discussion:
- Preference for cross section F on the existing alignment to be able to keep the greenway on the north side on existing alignment.
 - Game check area is a potential economic and greenway resource which would be negatively impacted by Option 1 or 2 in this area.
 - Curved bridges require piers and use more land.



- The CatEx will have a 7 year shelf life so whatever pieces don't get built in this phase will be able to be constructed in the future without additional clearance requirements.
- The un-paved section is dangerous and may add to the air/noise issues, will be important to pave.

8. East of Doghouse Rail Bridge Decision Area –:

- Most of this is cross section D with an option for cross section E in a couple locations. General concurrence from attendees.
- Discussion of whether the western area with extra room should be a separated trail area or a water quality area.
- Barriers create new wildlife obstructions

9. Eastern Decision Area:

- Preference for cross section B.
- How/where do the bikes cross from creek side to the hillside?
- Timing of implementation between Twin Tunnels vs. Phase II. Tim noted that we should make sure the frontage road project shows the separate greenway so that if the Twin Tunnels impacts the frontage road, they will have to mitigate the impacts to the road and trail.

10. Other Discussions

- Need to define the "pre-twin tunnels" improvement phase and the rest of the improvements as future. We also need to define the construction phases (and show them on maps):
 - Frontage Road Phase I,
 - Twin Tunnels Detour,
 - Twin Tunnels project,
 - Twin Tunnels detour removal/reconstruct,
 - Future improvements – which are CDOT commitments and which are local responsibilities?
- Need to define preferred greenway options to develop estimates so CDOT knows how much money will be needed for Phase 2.
- CCC priorities for implementation – how far can the \$6M go? Why doesn't it cover the unpaved section? More details on total project costs to be provided at rescheduled meeting.

11. Next Steps

- Team will develop concepts and costs based on PLT 2.5 and Greenway ITF
- CDOT will need to develop timelines and agreements for Phase II with Idaho Springs and Clear Creek County.