Meeting Summary

Technical Team #3

September 13, 2017 | CDOT Offices - Golden

Introductions and Overview

CDR, Jonathan Bartsch, welcomed participants. Self-introductions followed, then Jonathan introduced meeting agenda.

Outcomes from the TT Meeting #2:

- Endorsed the Charter
- Endorsed the Process (Step #2 of the 6-Step Decision-Making Process)
- Discussed Roadway Definitions

Target Dates

- 30% Design – February 2018
- NEPA Document Finalization – July 2018
- 1041 Permitting – Summer/Fall of 2018
- Shelf/Advertisement – Fall 2018 (subject to funding)

Other Project Updates

- Smart 70
  - First concept finished
  - Currently deploying short range radios tied into roadside units and fiber backbone.
- Idaho Springs Transit Center
  - New Bustang circulation pattern at 240 intersection has been proposed which will address existing circulation patterns and positively affect Idaho Springs Bustang riders by increasing travel speeds.
- Colorado Boulevard Reconstruction
  - Phase 2 through the middle of town is complete
  - Asphalt is currently being poured and utilities are being laid
Two houses behind Tommy Knockers’ Brewery ready to be demolished

- Greenway
  - Positive funding potential for Greenway, meeting later in the week to discuss further. October 8 is a fundraiser to hopefully generate $100k in private funds.
- Floyd Hill
  - Kickoff Project Leadership Team meeting this afternoon - 9/13/17
- Geohazard Mitigation Program
  - Rock scaling occurring West of Fall River Road; erection of a temporary fence that will be taken down when work is complete.
  - Reestablish a ditch line on I-70/CR 308.
- Fall River Road Bridge
  - Public meeting was held last night with St. Mary’s HOA. Public feedback showed enthusiasm for connection of Stanley Road and Fall River Road with a vehicle bridge.

CSS Process

Kevin led the group in a discussion of the definition of sustainability. The group was presented with different variations of sustainability including Environmentally Sustainable Society, Sustainable Landscapes, Economic Sustainability and Ecological Sustainability. (See attached handout.) Given the wide range of organizations and perspectives working together, a clear definition of sustainability is necessary since it is also an evaluation criterion. After discussion, the group agreed on:

“Sustainable Development—is the organizing principle for meeting human development goals, while at the same time sustaining the ability of natural, economic and social systems to provide the natural resources and ecosystem services upon which the economy, society, and the environment depends.”

Randy Wheelock noted that as this definition of sustainability is translated into an evaluation criterion, it is important to ensure that alternatives are not eliminated due to economic feasibility only. Andy Marsh from Idaho Springs noted that economic sustainability and aesthetics are important when considering the alternatives.

TT Agreement: Definition of Sustainability to be added to the Glossary of Terms.
Community Considerations

The group reviewed the Community Considerations that were originally identified during the Concept Development Process and have been updated numerous times during this NEPA process. Gina and Kevin outlined an approach for connecting the Community Considerations and Critical Issues when defining the Evaluation Criteria to be used to evaluate alternatives. When reviewing the Community Considerations and organizing them by the Core Value (see handout) it was noted that many of the Considerations are site specific design concepts. Comments on Community Considerations included:

- Segment 2, Environment #11 and Segment 3, Environment #5 should also mention “deer underpasses/overpasses and Animal-Vehicle Collisions should be considered,” as suggested by CPW.
- Segment 2, Mobility and Access #6. That off-ramp should be better designed to have less-impact on the neighborhoods.

Core Values and Critical Issues

- A few Critical Issues from the Community category were moved into the Recreation category since it is new. These included “unintended consequences of mobility and accessibility” and “preserve a sense of place”
- Adherence to MOU moved to Decision Making
- Under Safety, sight-distance and rock fall has been added.

Evaluation Criteria

- The evaluation criteria were discussed including how best to ensure the explicit connection of how the Core Values and Critical Issues influence decision making. It was noted that for each issue identified there will be issue-specific criteria that applies to it and that the higher-level Evaluation Criteria on the CSS Process Chart should stay general.
- The TT expressed understanding and appreciation for how decisions will be made and it was noted that the TT has a responsibility to connect their issues of concern during discussions. The Staff Team indicated a willingness to help explicitly make the connection between the Community Considerations/Critical Issues and project decisions.
- TT members noted that the objective of making decisions in this way will help others understand how decisions were made.
- Step #3 of 6-Step Decision-Making process – Establish Criteria - is completed and the TT members agreed to move forward with the process outlined.
Outcomes from Issue Task Force Meetings

Vanessa Henderson discussed outcomes from the ALIVE and SWEEP meetings.

- **ALIVE**
  - Empire Junction is a Linkage Interference Zone
  - Area of bighorn mortality where the animals cross East to West along US 40 (I-70 WB off-ramp and I-70 WB on-ramp are concern areas with high speeds). They do not cross North to South across I-70.
  - CDOT will talk with maintenance and USFS to figure out why they’re coming down this area; attracted to deicing chemicals, grass, water?
  - Consideration of a buffer zone between the shoulder and bighorn sheep habitat. This could include adding barriers, fencing, etc.
  - Rock cut mitigation techniques are not friendly to raptors and will be considered during design.
  - Canada Lynx habitat is about 9,000 feet. Only one has been seen in this area (at someone’s driveway up Fall River Road), but the project will assess impacts to them.

- **SWEEP**
  - The WB PPSL isn’t directly impacting the creek because the creek is only adjacent to the WB I-70 in a couple of areas and those areas are wide enough that there shouldn’t be impacts. Impacts should be indirect unless things change as the design process progresses.
  - Mineralization, mining and petroleum—be aware of those concerns and incorporate BMPs. Area west of Idaho Springs to Fall River Road is worst location for mineralization.
  - Near Dumont, interstate was built over mined areas and need to be aware of that in the event of digging.
  - Petroleum from spills and from normal vehicles drippings. Be aware and incorporate BMPs.
  - Fish—discussed in ALIVE meeting, no greenback pools or species. CPW believes all the populations are hybrids, but are confirming through their records.
  - Want to make sure where the high value/large populations of fish are.
  - If putting in culverts or modifying existing culverts, need to consider fish passage.
  - One very small wetland area near Dumont that might be impacted, limited functionality. There are wetlands at the Empire interchange; however, they won’t be impacted based on distance from the highway and aren’t being surveyed.
o Question: Public access and use of the creek by rafters now and in the future, is that a part of this discussion?
  · This project will have impacts and there are areas for improvement. Such as rafting. Opportunity to better manage the impact on the creek going forward. This was not discussed in the SWEEP meeting, but has been added to the list of considerations moving forward.

Outreach Summary

Draft Public Outreach Plan

● One additional in person public meeting planned for late 2017 or early 2018
● Two online public meetings (planning for fall 2017 and spring/summer 2018)
● Small group meetings including but not limited to rafting, low income, and minority groups

ACTION ITEM: Add business community, chambers of commerce, etc. to small group outreach.

Additional Discussion

● Does this type of project trigger noise mitigation?
  o FHWA has determined this will be treated like EB PPSL – it is not in a category of type of project that requires a full analysis that would look at mitigation, so no noise analysis or mitigation will be done.

Engineering Notes

1. Steve Long, Adam Parks and Chau Nguyen showed a video of a motorist driving on the WB lanes. The video was stopped and general discussion occurred flagging issues associated with adding the PPSL in the WB direction.

2. General Comments
   a. ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems) must remain active during construction.
   b. Two homes near health clinic may be removed by the town to add parking structure within Idaho Springs.
   c. Clear Creek Greenway project will parallel and cross I-70 at one location east of Idaho Springs. Coordinate between two projects.
   d. Idaho Springs would like any design to not preclude parking structure at 16th and Idaho Street.
   e. Idaho Springs would like future redesign of WB Exit 239 to reduce high speed traffic through a neighborhood. Ensure WB PPSL design
does not preclude future projects to redesign off ramp. Future development west of Idaho Springs on Stanley road could increase traffic through this interchange. Kelly Larson reminded Andy Marsh that any change to the gore point at the WB off ramp would require a new interchange modification process that FHWA would have to approve.

f. Idaho Springs would like CDOT to investigate a 3-way stop at EB 239; off ramp intersection with Stanley road. Existing ramp traffic has right of way and does not stop.

g. Further investigation into bighorn sheep movements is required at Empire Junction (see above ALIVE summary).

2. Schedule (estimated)
   a. Discussion of technology integration (including autonomous and connected vehicles) into WB PPSL to be moved up in TT issues schedule.
   b. TT#4 will continue Analysis discussion and components of overall width. TT#4 may not get to development of evaluation criteria and matrices as previously planned.

3. Engineering Discussion
   a. Roadway
      i. Existing glare screen will be evaluated and possible additions/reductions will be identified.
      ii. Idaho Springs commented that exit 240 WB entrance feels short. CDOT West Program previously analyzed ramp length and determined curve radius can be lengthened to increase acceleration length.
      iii. Entrance ramps shall include recovery area where possible in WB PPSL design.
   b. ROW/Survey
      i. No ROW is anticipated to be needed with this project.
   c. Hydraulics
      i. Narrow shoulders will impact hydraulic design. Increased number of inlets required to reduce ponding on the highway.
      ii. Existing drains through barrier at exit 240 have been paved over and possibly contribute to ponding in this area.
   d. Parking
      i. While the PPSL project will impact the south edge of the parking area near exit 240, the total number of parking spaces in the lot are expected to remain unchanged. Idaho Springs
would like to work with CDOT in considering alternative parking lot configurations.

e. Structures
   i. Bridge widening or replacement is not a part of project now.
   ii. Barrier type can provide sound reduction as well as increase safety. Height of barrier to be closely analyzed to balance view shed, safety, and noise considerations.
   iii. Future “wall” TT meeting will discuss options for walls. This will address wall height, length and type which can drastically affect construction schedule, traffic control, visual impact and ground disturbance. Future wall TT meeting is on the TT schedule.

f. Maintenance
   i. Maintenance crews to be engaged in future shoulder width and barrier discussion. Snow removal is an important component to the design of WBPPSL.
   ii. No knowledge of existing complaints from Idaho Springs residents over snow/traction sand entering their property from I-70.

g. Environmental
   i. Existing sound levels have been monitored. Many locations are close to or above the noise abatement criteria.
   ii. Historic surveys have been done and a possible new residential district has been identified in Idaho Springs east of the Commercial District. Andy asked how that would affect homeowners wanting to make changes to their properties. Gina and Vanessa described the Section 106 requirements which do not affect what homeowners can do. Gina offered to send a map of this possible district with a discussion of what Section 106 affects (primarily what a federal agency can do on a federally funded project). A revised Area of Potential Effect (APE) map has been sent to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).
   iii. One wetland has been identified near Dumont.
   iv. Several waters of the US have been identified throughout the study area. This includes Clear Creek, Mill Creek and Soda Creek along with various tributaries.

4. Technical Team “Homework”
   a. Review the videos distributed on a jump drive;
   b. Drive the existing EB PPSL during weekend operations and make observations about problem areas;
c. Review westbound project area and consider what different widths you would desire at various locations for the roadway elements discussed (inside shoulder, lane width, outside shoulder, shy distance etc.). Come prepared to discuss what are appropriate widths for each of those elements and we will use a building block approach to develop the total width.

Next Steps

- Data collection
- Refine proposed concept with Tech Team

Action Items and Agreements

**Action Item:** Add “…the economy, society, and the environment…” to the definition of Sustainability.

**TT Agreement: Definition of Sustainability.**


**Action Item:** Add the business community, chamber of commerce, and other economic groups to small group meetings during Public Outreach Plan.

**Action Item:** HDR to send a map with the possible residential historic district – and a description of the Section 106 process, after CDOT consideration.

**Action Item:** Evaluate the proper jersey barrier dimensions in Idaho Springs as part of the design phase.

**Action Item:** Add a list of all action items (from all Tech Team meetings) with status of each

Attendees
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