

**I 70 Collaborative Effort
January 26, 2010**

Draft Meeting Summary

Comparative Analysis

Description - Does the description capture the consensus recommendation alternative?

Bill Scheuerman, CDOT, reviewed the description of the consensus recommendation using maps and a narrative summary. The biggest difference between the minimum and maximum programs is improvements to Clear Creek County; everything west of the tunnel is the same. The assumptions about the AGS system are the same as used in the draft EIS. An AGS could be analyzed differently in tier two.

Q: Is a third bore at the EJMT included in the minimum program of improvements?

A: The comparative analysis included a third bore at both the Twin tunnels and EJMT in both the minimum and maximum program of improvements. These third bores would accommodate six lanes and AGS..

Q: Is there a reason the Eagle interchange was dropped?

A: The Eagle interchange is part of the no-action alternative which remains. It is assumed the interchange is already in place. Impacts from the interchange are contained in other documents and not part of our decision.

Q: Is the reference to 55 and 65 mph options related to highway or AGS?

A: The reference is only to the highway; we will clarify that in the document.

Q: Is the 6 lanes through the twin tunnels in both the minimum and maximum; right now only stated in one?

A: It should say “through the twin tunnels” in the Preferred Alternative document for both.

Q: Do all the alternatives meet purpose and need? If the minimum program meets purpose and need why would the maximum be implemented? There are far greater wetland impacts for the maximum.

A: It is the entire program, minimum and maximum that meets purpose and need.

Q: How did PLT respond to the question – does the description capture the consensus recommendation?

A: [several members of the PLT weighed in] We are satisfied the description is accurate and includes enough flexibility for adjustments for alignment and technology in the future. The description is unique in describing the first steps (minimum) and the long-term steps (maximum). There could be more on the process regarding the triggers; if/when triggers are implemented.

Q: Are the Federal agencies comfortable the description meets your needs?

A: Yes.

AGREEMENT: Yes, this definition captures the CR with a note that 65/55 mph is regarding hwy speeds and addition of “through” the twin tunnels in preferred alternative document.

Methodology of Comparative Analysis of Alternative - Is the methodology acceptable for comparing impacts?

Bill Scheurman, CDOT, reviewed the summary of comparative analysis showing the range of impacts for all alternatives (minimum/maximum impacts) compared with impacts of the minimum and maximum programs. The difference between the minimum and maximum program is the extent of the specific highway improvements. Mitigation was not included in the analysis; avoidance was not included in analysis. Mitigation and avoidance will be addressed in tier two when refining the alternatives further. The assumption is the worst case scenario.

Q: Did you look at vertical options through Clear Creek County?

A: Yes, in the maximum program in Idaho Springs we looked at stacking the highway above AGS.

Q: What are your assumptions around location and elevation on AGS?

A: The definition of the AGS was the one used in the draft EIS. It varies depending on certain areas, however it is mostly elevated and mostly in the median as in the full AGS-Highway combination alternative. The minimum exceptions are Floyd Hill to Eisenhower-Johnson tunnel where it is on one side or the other.

Q: Why only look at pm10 and carbon monoxide impacts?

A: This is just an example to show the tool/methodology, the FPEIS will look at a full range.

Q: Are you taking into account lower ozone standards?

A: Yes. The standard will affect all alternative equally. The reevaluation has all updated standards.

AGREEMENT: Yes, the methodology is acceptable for comparing impacts.

Proceed with Preferred Alternative - Based on the comparative analysis of environmental impacts, is there agreement that the consensus recommendation can proceed as the preferred alternative??

Q: How does minimum program meet increased capacity? Are we boxing ourselves in?

A: The key is looking for a balance. We have not boxed ourselves in from making new decisions in the future when we run out of capacity and/or new technology becomes available. The minimum is not an alternative by itself; it is part of a package that includes the minimum and maximum program. Finally the “Comparative Analysis-Key Resources impacts and Balance with Mobility Improvements” document is only for reference, a summary/example for this meeting only and not a formal document for the record.

| |
|---|
| AGREEMENT: Yes, the consensus recommendation should proceed as the preferred alternative. This is not an endorsement of whether a supplemental is required. |
|---|

Review of FPEIS schedule and CE involvement & Next Steps

1. Idaho Springs and CDOT are discussing the interchanges in Idaho Springs
2. Project Leadership Team (PLT) will develop a draft Implementation Plan to be reviewed by CE – including a process to prioritize projects and decide where to start
3. **May 7, 2010 – Collaborative Effort Meeting – review the draft Implementation Plan and discuss involvement of the CE post FPEIS ROD.;**
The PLT’s mission ends at the ROD – who becomes the guiding organization that initiates convening the CE if necessary in-between the scheduled every two year meeting?

Draft PFEIS/CE Schedule

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| January 2010: | CE Meeting 1: CE meets to review Comparative Analysis and develop agreement on the Preferred Alternative and review FPEIS schedule and CE involvement. |
| May 2010 | CE Meeting 2: Develop agreement on the role of C.E. in PFEIS, PEIS Implementation Plan and the priority of early action projects and post ROD. |
| <i>Spring 2010:</i> | <i>Re-evaluation complete. PLT review results of the Re-evaluation and identifies issues, if any, requiring CE discussion and decisions.</i> |
| Summer 2010: | CE Meeting 3: Initial internal draft FPEIS complete. CE meets to 1) discuss and resolve any major issues resulting from the re-evaluation review by the FHWA, CDOT Project Team and PLT, if any, 2) confirm that the Final PEIS internal draft is consistent with the intent of the Consensus Recommendation, 3) discuss mechanics of the CE once the Final PEIS is complete and released. |
| Fall 2010: | External Agency Review of Final PEIS complete |
| Dec 2010/Jan 2011: | CE Meeting 4: CE meets, if necessary, to review any issues arising from external agency reviews prior to public review |
| Early 2011: | Final PEIS released for public review |
| <i>Spring 2011:</i> | <i>PLT reviews public comments on Final PEIS and identifies any major issues requiring CE resolution.</i> |
| Spring 2011: | CE Meeting 5: CE meets to 1) review the comment summary on the Final PEIS before the ROD, and resolve any major issues and 2) finalize mechanics of the CE role going forward including evaluating triggers and obtaining funding. |
| Late 2011: | ROD completed |