



# **I-70 Mountain Corridor Record of Decision**

## *2020 Reassessment*

**December 2020**



I-70 Mountain Corridor  
2020 Reassessment



## Contents

Introduction and Purpose .....	1
Reassessment Work Plan .....	2
Work Plan Step 1: Reassess the Purpose and Need .....	3
Observations on Context.....	4
Land Use and Recreational Pressures .....	4
High-Speed Transit Technology .....	4
Climate Change.....	4
Observations on Components of the Purpose and Need.....	5
Increase Capacity .....	5
Improve Mobility and Accessibility .....	5
Decrease Congestion.....	5
Environmental Sensitivity and Community Values .....	5
Work Plan Step 2: Effectiveness of the Preferred Alternative Implementation.....	7
Observations on Measuring/Assessing Effectiveness .....	8
Observations on the Effectiveness of the Implementation of Preferred Alternative Components .....	8
Non-Infrastructure Related Components .....	8
Advanced Guideway System (AGS) .....	9
Highway Improvements .....	9
Effectiveness of CSS and Agreements .....	10
Work Plan Step 3: Clarifications to the Preferred Alternative.....	10
EJMT Third Bore .....	10
I-70/US 40 Empire Junction Interchange .....	10
2025 Triggers.....	11
AGS Definition.....	11
Maximum Program of Improvements.....	12
Work Plan Step 4: Future Actions Work Plan .....	12
Conclusion.....	13



## Attachments

- 1 2020 Reassessment Work Plan
- 2 CE and CE Subcommittee Meeting Notes
- 3 Technical Narratives
- 4 Preferred Alternative Tracking Sheet
- 5 CE Future Actions Step 4 Work Plan



## Acronyms

AGS	Advanced Guideway System
ALIVE	A Landscape Level Inventory of Valued Ecosystem Components
CDOT	Colorado Department of Transportation
CE	Collaborative Effort
CSS	Context Sensitive Solutions
EJMT	Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PEIS	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
PPSL	peak period shoulder lane
ROD	Record of Decision
SWEEP	Stream and Wetland Ecological Enhancement Program



## INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

On June 16, 2011, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) signed the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD) approving the Preferred Alternative for the I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), marking the end of nearly 20 years of studying and discussing improvements for the 144-mile I-70 Mountain Corridor from C-470 in the west Denver metropolitan area to Glenwood Springs. The Preferred Alternative consists of non-infrastructure components, an Advanced Guideway System (AGS) (transit), and a flexible program of highway improvements (referred to as Minimum and Maximum Programs) that adapt to future trends.

To reach agreement on the Preferred Alternative, FHWA and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) participated as part of the Collaborative Effort (CE), a consensus-building process to identify a Consensus Recommendation for improvements. The Preferred Alternative selected by the ROD adopted the Consensus Recommendation. The criteria below, outlined in the Consensus Recommendation and described in the ROD (Section D, Basis for the Selection of the Preferred Alternative), informed the CE's recommendation and continue to inform effectiveness criteria:

- The solution should improve safety and mobility for all users.
- The solution should be responsive and adaptive to broader global trends that will affect the way we make travel decisions in the future.
- The solution will meet the Purpose and Need and all environmental and legal requirements.
- The solution should preserve, restore, and enhance community and cultural resources.
- The solution should preserve and restore or enhance ecosystem functions.
- The solution should be economically viable over the long term.

Additionally, the ROD provided an adaptive and incremental framework to implement the Preferred Alternative based on triggers where CDOT and the CE regularly review the current status of all projects and consider the triggers in evaluating the need for additional capacity improvements. As such, the ROD committed to reconvening the CE at least every two years to review progress on the implementation of the Preferred Alternative and to conduct a thorough review of the Preferred Alternative in 2020.

As explained in the ROD, "In 2020, regardless of the status of the triggers, there will be a thorough reassessment of the overall Purpose and Need and effectiveness of the implementation of components of the Preferred Alternative. At that time, the full range of improvements evaluated at Tier 1 may be reconsidered. In addition, the Collaborative Effort stakeholder committee (including the lead agencies) may reconsider the full range of improvements evaluated in the Final PEIS, or pursue a new process because the context in which this Tier 1 decision was made is so changed that none of the alternatives evaluated in



the Final PEIS meets future transportation needs. Global, regional, and local trends such as peak oil, climate change, technological advances, and changing demographics could affect these future transportation needs.”

## REASSESSMENT WORK PLAN

For the 2020 Reassessment, the CE, including FHWA and CDOT, developed a Work Plan to conduct this comprehensive review and designated a Reassessment CE Subcommittee to advance the Work Plan and facilitate consensus agreement from the CE. The Work Plan (Attachment 1) outlines five steps to the Reassessment:

- **Step 1:** Reassess the Purpose and Need
- **Step 2:** Assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the Preferred Alternative
- **Step 3:** Clarify uncertainties of the components of the Preferred Alternative
- **Step 4:** Develop a list of potential future actions for continued pursuit of the Preferred Alternative
- **Step 5:** Develop a Reassessment Document

Through the course of the Reassessment, the CE and CE Subcommittee met 10 times from January 2020 through December 2020 in half-day and full-day workshops to progress through the Work Plan.<sup>1</sup> Meeting notes are included in Attachment 2. CDOT, with the support of the CE, retained HDR Engineering and Peak Consulting Group to provide technical support for Steps 1 and 2 of the Work Plan and to complete the documentation in Step 5. Steps 3 and 4 of the Work Plan were led by the CE and the CE contracted with an independent facilitator, CDR Associates, to enable the discussions and consensus on those steps.

Through this process, the CE affirmed the Preferred Alternative and the implementation processes and agreements committed to in the ROD. The CE identified and committed to additional work to implement the Preferred Alternative, improve transportation conditions, and continue the I-70 Mountain Corridor Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process and other agreements to protect and enhance the environment and community values along the corridor. Consensus was achieved for each of the steps in the Work Plan (Exhibit 1).

---

<sup>1</sup> The CE and CE Subcommittee met three times in 2019 to finalize the Work Plan and solicit and review consultant proposals.



**Exhibit 1: Summary of Consensus on Work Plan Steps**

	Step 1	The CE concluded that the Purpose and Need under which the Preferred Alternative was developed remains valid.
	Step 2	The CE reviewed completed projects in the corridor and reached consensus that most of the implemented components had been effective (noting that some data were incomplete and not enough progress had been made in some areas to assess effectiveness).
	Step 3	Outstanding questions about the Preferred Alternative were identified and resolved.
	Step 4	The CE developed a work plan listing priority actions for continued implementation of the Preferred Alternative and identified subcommittees to champion those efforts.
	Step 5	Documentation of the effort is summarized in this report, and supplementary materials are appended to support future work of the CE in its Future Actions Step 4 Work Plan moving forward.

This document summarizes the conclusions and observations of each of the steps in the 2020 Reassessment effort. The following attachments support documentation of the Reassessment process and outline steps the CE will take for continued implementation of the Preferred Alternative:

- Attachment 1.** Reassessment Work Plan
- Attachment 2.** CE and CE Subcommittee Meeting Notes
- Attachment 3.** Technical Narratives
- Attachment 4.** Preferred Alternative Tracking Sheet
- Attachment 5.** CE Future Actions Step 4 Work Plan

**WORK PLAN STEP 1: REASSESS THE PURPOSE AND NEED**

The CE reached consensus that the context and the components of the Purpose and Need are still valid based on the current context. After thorough discussion of each of the components of context and Purpose and Need, the CE Subcommittee and CE concluded that:

- The context under which the Purpose and Need was developed remains relevant, recognizing that since the ROD, land use, recreation, and climate change pressures have intensified and technological advances in high-speed transit and operational management strategies are increasingly appropriate to serve person trip demand in the corridor.



- The Purpose and Need remains valid. It identifies persistent transportation needs to increase person-trip capacity, improve mobility and accessibility for people and freight, and reduce congestion and travel delays through the I-70 Mountain Corridor. The Purpose and Need also recognizes the need for transportation solutions in the corridor to provide for and accommodate environmental sensitivity and respect for community values.

Attachment 3 includes technical narratives, which informed the CE conclusions and provide supplemental data supporting the purpose and need evaluation. Additional observations related to both the context and Purpose and Need are documented below.

## Observations on Context

The Preferred Alternative was developed with a 50-year vision that remains valid and generally captures the current context influencing the Purpose and Need. Several conditions identified in the PEIS have intensified.

### **LAND USE AND RECREATIONAL PRESSURES**

The challenge of balancing access to and conservation of recreational resources has intensified. Overuse of resources is becoming a more significant issue for protecting the environment and quality of recreational experiences. Additionally, the outdoor recreation economy shapes the Mountain Corridor and continues to put significant pressure on the need for affordable housing for workers supporting the industry.

### **HIGH-SPEED TRANSIT TECHNOLOGY**

High-speed transit technology is evolving rapidly, and most members feel strongly that its application and feasibility for the Mountain Corridor is strengthened by these advances. The increasing common deployment of high-speed technology in operating systems around the world, particularly for areas with similar mountainous terrain, such as the Swiss Alps, is also a positive trend for AGS. Technological advances do improve cost effectiveness, but some members noted that high-speed transit remains expensive to build and requires a stable, ongoing funding source to operate.

### **CLIMATE CHANGE**

The issue of climate change and its threat was documented in 2011 and considered in the context of the PEIS Purpose and Need. However, since the PEIS and ROD, cultural awareness of climate change has increased, and the need for more aggressive solutions to address it is more broadly understood. The CE acknowledges that the concern about climate change is not reflected in current federal government policies, but notes its membership agrees that climate change needed to be documented as a significant issue affecting the current context for the Mountain Corridor.



## Observations on Components of the Purpose and Need

The three interrelated needs describing the transportation problems in the Mountain Corridor remain valid, and the PEIS language describing those needs, particularly in relation to the focus on person trips rather than vehicle trips to describe transportation needs, is important and supported. The following observations for each of the components are noted below.

### **INCREASE CAPACITY**

The evaluation of capacity in terms of person trips rather than vehicle trips, as described in the PEIS Purpose and Need, is an important distinction. In the context of person trips, the CE agrees that additional capacity is needed. The issue of suppressed trips and induced demand (that increased capacity is filled up by latent demand) remains a concern, and a multimodal approach “beyond pavement” continues to be needed. The capacity for vehicles in terms of person trips also applies to freight, where capacity should be represented in efficiency/effectiveness of payload delivery, without presuming mode or method. Finally, the CE observed that transit demand in the I-70 Mountain Corridor is underrepresented because 1) comprehensive transit service is not available; 2) data regarding transit use are incomplete; for instance, private transit operators, which provide a significant portion of existing transit service, particularly to/from DEN, do not release ridership data; and 3) transit demand exceeds capacity, as evidenced by crowded transit vehicles that are often over-capacity on mainline I-70 and in local communities/recreational areas.

### **IMPROVE MOBILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY**

The CE agreed mobility continues to be a core transportation need in the Mountain Corridor and noted that mobility should be emphasized as the primary need because it drives the need for increased capacity. The CE reiterated the need to discuss mobility in terms of people not vehicles and noted that other factors beyond capacity affect mobility, such as affordable housing and longer commute times, and the spreading of delays from weekends to weekdays. Finally, the issues with risk and resiliency and how natural disasters - fires, floods, landslides - affect reliability / availability of the highway for all travelers and particularly for corridor communities are important considerations for developing projects.

### **DECREASE CONGESTION**

The CE agrees that congestion inhibits travel in the Mountain Corridor and notes that existing transit service is also affected by congestion, both in terms of inadequate system capacity as well as shared use of the congested highway for services.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY AND COMMUNITY VALUES**

In addition to transportation needs, the PEIS Purpose and Need provides additional considerations in developing alternatives and states:



“Alternatives must meet the transportation needs and be developed in a manner that provides for and accommodates the following:

**Environmental Sensitivity** - Avoid and minimize adverse impacts on and, where possible, enhance environmental resources, including, but not limited to, stream sedimentation, water quality, wildlife crossings, and impacts on wetlands.

**Respect for Community Values** - Avoid and minimize adverse impacts on and, where possible, enhance air quality, historic resources, noise levels, visual resources, and social and economic values, as well as minimize the transportation system’s footprint on the mountain communities. Consider the possible growth changes and economic effects that might occur, depending on the ease or difficulty of access.

**Safety** - Improve where possible problematic roadway geometric conditions, such as tight curves and lane drops, and consider the safety characteristics of the modes of travel. Undesirable safety conditions along the Corridor directly affect the project need, specifically the mobility, accessibility, and congestion elements.

**Ability to Implement** - Consider technical feasibility (that is, overall use of a mode and the feasibility of the technology), as well as affordability of alternatives in terms of capital costs, maintenance and operational costs, user costs, and environmental mitigation costs. Understanding the construction impacts on existing mobility and to the communities along the Corridor is important to evaluating implementation of alternatives.”

The need to measure and document the effectiveness of the Preferred Alternative implementation in providing for and accommodating environmental sensitivity and respect for community values is important and was a topic of much discussion throughout the review of Steps 1 and 2. The ROD requires Tier 2 processes and agreements, including the CSS process, Stream and Wetland Ecological Enhancement Program (SWEEP) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), A Landscape Level Inventory of Valued Ecosystem Components (ALIVE) MOU, and Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) be followed. The importance of these processes and agreements in meeting the Purpose and Need requirements for projects in the corridor was affirmed in Step 1 and assessed in Step 2.



## WORK PLAN STEP 2: EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE IMPLEMENTATION

The CE affirmed all of the major components of the Preferred Alternative - non-infrastructure improvements, AGS, and highway improvements - remain relevant and are important and intertwined. The CE agreed all are needed to effectively address the transportation problems in the corridor.

The consultant team developed a tracking sheet showing each of the components of the Preferred Alternative Minimum Program of Improvements, as presented in the PEIS and ROD (Attachment 4).<sup>2</sup> For each component, the team reviewed and summarized the status of improvements (what had been accomplished); the evaluation was supported by technical narratives (Attachment 3). For components where improvements had been implemented, the consultant provided observations about the mobility and safety effectiveness of the completed or work-in-progress projects associated with each component based on project goals (needs addressed), research and review of “before and after” data, and judgements from Colorado State Patrol, CDOT maintenance, and corridor stakeholders, as applicable. Effectiveness for many of the components of the Preferred Alternative was characterized as “unknown” or “incomplete” because either no progress has been made toward implementation or data were not available to measure effectiveness. Where data were available, a ranking of High, Medium, or Low effectiveness was assigned. The observations and ratings were discussed with and endorsed by the CE and set the stage for the CE evaluation in Step 4 of the Work Plan regarding the actions needed to advance the Preferred Alternative.

The CE generally concluded that implemented improvements have been moderately effective in addressing the corridor Purpose and Need. However, not enough progress had been made toward advancing the Preferred Alternative, especially with regard to the AGS component, and the lack of progress on the AGS component complicated the assessment of AGS’s effect on needs and other components. While funding is a challenge, more tangible action is needed. Much of the “low hanging fruit” has been picked, and there have been no “game changers” to address major mobility and safety challenges in the corridor.

The CE also noted thorough support for the framework that the ROD establishes for considering and evaluating environmental sensitivity and community values in the needs; the adaptive management approach to implementation of projects, which provides flexibility and allows for innovative ideas and new technologies to be advanced; and the CSS process. The CE

---

<sup>2</sup> The Maximum Program of Improvements was not evaluated because the triggers have not been met.



noted that the CSS process is especially effective when it is carried through all the life cycles of project development.

Additional observations on how effectiveness is measured and discussion of effectiveness of the non-infrastructure, AGS, and highway components are included below.

### Observations on Measuring/Assessing Effectiveness

Effectiveness was characterized broadly in terms of mobility and safety. Several CE Subcommittee members suggested additional measures, such as reliability. Rather than change the categories, the group agreed the disposition status of each component should be categorized for future effort needed: initiate effort, continue existing level of effort, increase effort, or deemphasize effort.

Providing for and accommodating environmental sensitivity and respect for community values is integral to the effectiveness of projects in the Mountain Corridor, and the CSS process, SWEEP MOU, ALIVE MOU, and Section 106 PA are commitments for every Tier 2 project. These values will be measured by reviewing Tier 2 project implementation and documenting lessons learned and process improvements that have occurred since the PEIS and ROD.

### Observations on the Effectiveness of the Implementation of Preferred Alternative Components

The Preferred Alternative tracking sheet captures the conclusions of the CE review of the effectiveness of the Preferred Alternative implementation. The CE recorded additional overarching observations related to the main components of the non-infrastructure, AGS, and highway improvements as noted below.

#### NON-INFRASTRUCTURE RELATED COMPONENTS

Although observations can be made generally, measuring progress for the non-infrastructure components, either qualitatively or quantitatively, is difficult because these actions are not intended to be completed but expected to evolve over time. Usage and effectiveness data are difficult to obtain. Additionally, many of these components are actions that are taken by others (for example, the I-70 Coalition).

The implemented non-infrastructure components were found to be effective in addressing some issues on the corridor but have low effectiveness at addressing core corridor needs on their own. The lower effectiveness of the non-infrastructure components is expected because this category of improvements is not intended to create long-term solutions independently but rather complement AGS and highway improvements in the Preferred Alternative.

The Peak Period Shoulder Lane (PPSL) projects have had a bigger impact because they are broader in scope even though they are interim and stayed mostly within the existing interstate footprint.



## ADVANCED GUIDEWAY SYSTEM (AGS)

The feasibility study for AGS has been completed, but little progress has been made to advance the AGS concept, and no progress has been made to advance a functioning system that could trigger evaluation of the Maximum Program. The lack of progress on the AGS is a concern because it is considered a game changer for improving mobility in the corridor but also very costly and could prevent additional, more affordable improvements from moving forward.

The AGS study conclusion that the AGS was not financially feasible “at the time” (e.g., 2014), is dated, and the financial feasibility may be greater now with improvements in technology, greater use of public-private partnerships, and greater political will.

The CE agreed that additional work is needed to assess both technological and financial feasibility of AGS. How to advance AGS was a significant focus of the Step 4 actions developed by the CE.

## HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

The CE felt the highway improvements were generally more effective because more effort and funding had been directed to this component of the Preferred Alternative. The CE made several observations about the highway improvements:

- Six-lane capacity is intentionally distinct from a six-lane highway template. (Note: this comment applies to the Maximum Program, which is not triggered at this time.) If the six-lane capacity of the Maximum Program becomes a six-lane highway solution, a redesign of the existing roadway between the Veterans Memorial Tunnels and Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels is anticipated, and previous visioning exercises conducted by Clear Creek County and Idaho Springs (in 2014 and 2016) should be honored. (See <https://www.clearcreekcounty.us/684/Interstate-70-Visioning-Plan> for the visioning documents.) The CE also noted that the agreement for the PPSLs as non-infrastructure improvements mean they may not be used for expansion into, nor as a component of, the Maximum Program’s six-lane highway
- Interchange improvements that have not been implemented should be classified as “unknown” in terms of effectiveness.
- Highway projects, particularly large-scale ones like Floyd Hill and West Vail Pass, need to take a deeper look into “not precluding” AGS. Several members noted that the evaluations have been superficial due to the lack of AGS expertise on Project Leadership Teams and Technical Teams.



## EFFECTIVENESS OF CSS AND AGREEMENTS

The CE highly supports the CSS process and the significant time that stakeholders have devoted to developing and implementing the Preferred Alternative in a manner that honors the CSS process.

They noted variability in the application of CSS; some projects more effectively used the CSS process and other agreements. The most effective projects in providing for and accommodating environmental sensitivity and respect for community values were those that carried CSS through all the life cycles, included tracking of environmental and community values through those phases, and incorporated best practices and lessons learned from previous projects.

## WORK PLAN STEP 3: CLARIFICATIONS TO THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Through developing the Work Plan and discussing the Preferred Alternative during Steps 1 and 2 of the Work Plan, five aspects of the ROD and Preferred Alternative were identified by the CE for further discussion or clarification: the status of the Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels (EJMT) Third Bore, the I-70/US 40 Empire Junction Interchange scope of improvements, the 2025 Triggers, the definition of AGS, and the definition of the Maximum Program highway improvements component. In all cases, the discussions concluded that no changes to the ROD or Preferred Alternative were needed.

### EJMT Third Bore

The CE wanted to clarify whether the EJMT third bore is part of the Minimum or Maximum Program of Improvements because the PEIS does not specifically classify the EJMT third bore in either program or as a separate improvement project. After discussion, the CE concluded that the EJMT expansion should be classified in the Minimum Program. This conclusion was based on the relationship of the EJMT improvements to other parts of the Preferred Alternative that are clearly outlined in the Minimum Program, such as the Vail Pass auxiliary lanes and the AGS bore through the Continental Divide. Further, expanding the EJMT would not trigger the Maximum Program and classifying the EJMT expansion in the Minimum Program provides more flexibility to advance this discrete but complex action, such as if tolling could fund its expansion.

### I-70/US 40 Empire Junction Interchange

The CE wanted to clarify the scope of improvements for Empire Junction as a “specific highway improvement” in the Minimum Program. Clear Creek County understands that the intent of the interchange reconstruction is to support short-term safety and mobility in the interchange area, but not reconstruction that supports the Maximum Program. This



clarification is important because the design of the Maximum Program highway improvements is unknown and, therefore, how the interchange would interact with Maximum Program improvements cannot be determined. The group agreed that the specific highway improvement for Empire Junction is intended to meet immediate safety and mobility needs and is separate from the Maximum Program. This conclusion is consistent with the PEIS description of specific highway improvements and that they "...are not subject to the parameters established for future capacity components..."

## 2025 Triggers

The CE wanted to clarify the intent of the following language for the second trigger related to AGS (bolded below for emphasis):

"The specific highway improvements are complete and Advanced Guideway System studies that answer questions regarding the feasibility, cost, ridership, governance, and land use are complete and indicate that an **Advanced Guideway System cannot be funded or implemented by 2025 or is otherwise deemed unfeasible to implement...**"

The group discussed the meaning of "funded" and "implemented" and whether this presented a deadline for AGS. The CE remains committed to getting the AGS built and that in that spirit, the commitment should not expire in 2025. FHWA clarified that the 2025 trigger was not intended to be a trigger to eliminate AGS and that a lot of specific highway improvements are also outstanding, so it is very unlikely that the Maximum Program could be triggered regardless of whether AGS is funded or implemented.

CE members that participated in the Consensus Recommendation suggested that the 2025 language may have been included to ensure that AGS remained a central component of the Preferred Alternative and not get relegated to a back burner to highway improvements.

The group concluded that no changes are needed to the language and agreed that 2025 is not a deadline for AGS.

## AGS Definition

The definition of AGS in the ROD, especially related to technology, was raised for potential clarification by some CE members that felt the definition was too loose or vague to accurately describe the intent of the AGS component of the Preferred Alternative. After discussion, the group agreed that the definition in the ROD ("The specific technology for the Advanced Guideway System has not been defined but is intended to represent a modern, "state-of-the-art" transit system.") captures the intention that the AGS be a modern, state of the art transit system that left open the possibility to take advantage of what is "state-of-the-art" at the time it is implemented. The undefined technology provides flexibility to adopt the newest technology, which was the intent of the AGS definition. In the past decade since the ROD, the



open technology language had not restricted any discussions to date and no changes to the definition were recommended.

A related issue was raised regarding the AGS design. The AGS design is kept “wide open” as other large roadway projects move forward. The CE discussed whether more analysis of AGS conflicts beyond an overlay of the alignments was needed to answer the question of whether AGS would be precluded. Even if projects did not rise to the level of precluding the AGS, would significant reconstruction or cost be encountered when AGS was implemented? Did Project Leadership Teams have sufficient expertise to answer questions about how AGS would fit in with highway improvements? The group agreed this was an important topic that should be discussed further in Step 4.

### Maximum Program of Improvements

Several clarifications were discussed regarding six-lane capacity in the Maximum Program (i.e., between Veterans Memorial Tunnels and EJMT). Two of the issues were directly addressed by the PEIS. First, the PEIS was intentional in the discussion of six-lane capacity, not lanes. This means people, not cars, and six-lane capacity is not the same as a six-lane highway section. Second, the “general alignment” of improvements along the existing I-70 highway could include – and Idaho Springs and Clear Creek County have conducted visioning exercises to recommend – moving the highway outside of its current footprint. Finally, the PPSL projects, while not envisioned in the PEIS, are non-infrastructure improvements that are separate from and cannot be considered as part of the six-lane capacity in the Maximum Program. This is clarified in the operating agreement for the Mountain Express Lanes (aka, PPSLs).

## WORK PLAN STEP 4: FUTURE ACTIONS WORK PLAN

The CE developed and refined the Future Actions Step 4 Work Plan during three workshops held on September 30, November 18, and December 16, 2020 (Attachment 5). The plan (attached) identifies a number of actions around the following topics:

- Travel Demand and Capacity
- CSS Process
- Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
- Outreach and Communication
- Non-AGS Transit Improvements
- Travel Demand Management
- Corridor Management
- Technology
- AGS

Four subcommittees were recommended to champion the Future Actions Step 4 Work Plan and CE members volunteered to serve on these committees. The subcommittees will organize and seek support to begin work in 2021. The subcommittees will report progress at future CE meetings.



## CONCLUSION

The Reassessment process confirmed the CE's commitment to the ROD Preferred Alternative as the right solution for the Corridor. The CE renewed its pledge to work collaboratively to advance the Preferred Alternative and to increase efforts on the AGS and non-infrastructure transit elements. The Consensus Recommendation developed by the CE and adopted as the ROD Preferred Alternative has stood the test of time. Its multimodal solution and unique implementation approach provide flexibility to adapt to changing conditions, harness innovative technologies, develop sustainable strategies, and respect the magnificent environment and communities along its route. The CSS process, corridor MOUs, agreements, and mitigation strategies provide a successful framework for developing Tier 2 projects and thinking creatively.

The CE has created a Future Actions Step 4 Work Plan to guide its activities through focused subcommittees. The CE Co-Chairs are working with CDOT and FHWA leadership to support the Work Plan and the recommendations that will come out of the subcommittees.