Westbound I-70 Mountain Corridor
Concept Development Process
Project Leadership Team (PLT)
Meeting #2
November 17, 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm - 1:15 pm</td>
<td>Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1:15 pm - 1:45 pm | **Presentation and Discussion: CSS Process Overview, Roles and Project Outcomes**  
Goal: PLT understanding and support of WB I-70 Mtn Corridor process, project team and stakeholder roles, schedule and desired outcomes |
| 1:45 pm - 2:30 pm | **Presentation and Discussion: Context Statement, Core Values and Critical Issues**  
Goal: PLT review and discussion of WB I-70 Mtn Corridor context statement, core values and identification of additional critical issues |
| 2:30 pm - 2:45 pm | **Discussion: Study Area and Technical Team Formation**  
Goal: Discuss the study area limits and outline the Technical Team |
| 2:45 pm - 3:00 pm | **Next Steps and Closing** |
Process Guidelines

- Implement CSS Process for WB I-70 Mountain Corridor
- Work within the parameters of the ROD and other agreements
- Agree on the Project Scope
- Focus on advancing feasible concepts into the NEPA process
- Communicate effectively by raising issues and concerns early and directly
- Collaboration among and between teams and stakeholders
- Consistent participation of TT members, not responsible to backtrack
CSS Process Overview, Roles and Project Outcomes
I-70 Mountain Corridor Westbound Concept Development Process (example)

1. Define Desired Outcomes and Actions
   - Set and endorse process

2. Endorse the Process
   - PLT

3. Establish Criteria
   - TT
   - Seg 1
     - Segment Vision
     - Segment Goal
     - Segment Specific Criteria
   - Seg 1
     - Concept Workplan
   - Seg 1
     - Evaluation

4. Develop Alternatives or Options
   - PLT
   - TT
   - Seg 1
     - Specific Process or Design Considerations
   - Seg 1
     - Specific Process or Design Considerations
   - Seg 2
     - ITF
     - Seg 2
     - ITF
     - Seg 3
     - TT

5. Evaluation, Select, and Refine Alternative or Option
   - TT
   - Seg 2
     - ITF
     - Seg 2
     - ITF
     - Seg 3
     - TT
     - Seg 3
     - ITF

6. Finalize Documentation and Evaluation Process
   - TT
   - Seg 3
     - ITF
     - Seg 3
     - ITF

4 to 6 Months

- PLT Meeting (Example: define and endorse process)
- Technical Teams (Example: provide technical input for specific segment or entire corridor)
- Issues Task Forces (Example: geotechnical experts discuss landslide)
Project Teams

- Project Leadership Team (PLT)
- Technical Teams (TT)
  - Stakeholders
  - CDOT
  - FHWA
  - Consultants and Contractors
    - HDR
    - THK
    - CDR
- Issue Task Force (ITF)
Project Team Roles

- **Project Leadership Team (PLT)**
  - CSS process, guidance and issue resolution.

- **Technical Teams (TT)**
  - Segment and technical experts

- **Issue Task Force (ITF)**
  - Specific issue experts
Project Outcomes

➢ Advance a range of feasible concepts into NEPA.
  ▪ Including identification of fatal flaws.

➢ Agreement on:
  ▪ Corridor Context Statement
  ▪ Core Values
  ▪ Critical Issues
  ▪ Criteria
  ** These agreements are for this life cycle phase and may be modified in the NEPA process

➢ This concept development phase is not a part of NEPA.
  ▪ Alternatives will need to be reexamined during the NEPA process.
  ▪ Important not to pre-judge level of environmental documentation required.
**Specific Highway Improvements**

- Six lanes capacity from Floyd Hill through the Twin Tunnels (now the Veterans Memorial Tunnels)
- Empire Junction interchange improvements
- EB auxiliary lane from EJMT to Herman Gulch
- WB auxiliary lane from Bakerville to EJMT
- Bike trail from Idaho Springs to US 6
- Frontage road from Idaho Springs to US 6

**Other Highway Projects**

- Truck operations improvements in non specified locations
- Interchange improvements at Georgetown, Downieville, Fall River Road, Base of Floyd Hill
What else?

What other commitments are implied or linked to this project that are not in the ROD?

i.e. Peak Period Shoulder Lane Projects
MOU signed in January 2014 MOU between Idaho Springs, Clear Creek County and CDOT

Relevant to this Process

- Agreement to a Westbound I-70 PPSL project from Twin Tunnels to Empire Junction.
  - It will not exceed the scope of the EB PPSL project.
- WB Floyd Hill project would include widening to three lanes, improving the design speed of both EB and WB, bridge replacement at the bottom of FH, interchange reconstruction at US 6 and Phase 2 of the Greenway and Frontage Road (CR 314 from Exit 241 to 243)
- CDOT will continue to explore demonstration opportunities for noise abatement at Lawson

None of these can preclude the preferred alternative.
Context Statement, Core Values and Critical Issues
Concept Development Process

Context Statement

Core Values

Critical Issues

Evaluation Criteria (from East Bound PPSP)

1. Address safety during peak times?
2. Maintain safety during offpeak times?
3. Improve mobility and reliability?
4. Maximize the effort required to maintain the option?
5. Create infrastructure investments that are reasonable to construct and provide the best value for their life cycle, function and purpose?
6. Allow for a process to engage and communicate with all local, regional and national users of the I-70 Mountain Corridor?
7. Create opportunities to "correct past damage"?
8. Provide access and protect opportunities for enhancements to tourist destinations, community facilities, interstate commerce and also limit disproportionate effects to the community?
9. Incorporate sustainability by using locally available materials and environmentally-friendly processes?
10. Protect or create unique features for the area as a gateway?
11. Protect wildlife areas?
12. Protect Clear Creek?
13. Meet CDOT and industry standards?
14. Achieve the aesthetic guidelines?
15. Meet the I-70 Mountain Corridor design criteria?
16. Preserve opportunities for the AGL and the ultimate preferred alternative?
17. Adaptable for future changes/projects?
18. Protect the defining historical elements of Clear Creek County?
19. Provide opportunities for partnership?

Safety

Mobility & Accessibility

Implementability

Community

Environment

Engineering Criteria & Aesthetic Guidelines

Sustainability

Historic Context

Decision Making

- Emergency Response
- Safety of Traveling Public
- Local and Tourist Driver Expectancy
- Incident Management
- Reliability
- Eliminate bottlenecks
- Operations
- Maintenance
- Active Management
- Robust Connectivity/Network
- Health, Responsible Costs
- Load Throttle Work
- Adverse Impacts to Existing/Community
- Minimize Infrastructure Improvements
- Adaptability
- Reusability
- Connectivity
- Recreation
- Tourism and Economy
- Local Access
- Traffic
- Usability
- Effects to low-income and minority population
- Clear Creek
  - Wildlife Habitat and Movement
  - Mining and Metals
  - Water Quality
  - Sediment
  - Air Quality
  - Noise
  - Wetlands
- Balance design using GIS guidance
- Aesthetics inspired by surroundings
- Adherence to MoU
- Use of Most Recent Technology
- Blends with Future Usabilities (AGL, Transit, Greenway, etc.)
- Meet & from demands of growth
- Sensitivity of Economy
- Adherence to I-70
- Lessons learned from I-70 / PPSP
- Continue strong partnerships
- Transparent and Clear process for the Public
- Maintain the spirit of the Past Agreements
The I-70 Mountain Corridor is a magnificent, scenic place. Human elements are woven through breathtaking natural features . . .

. . . a nationally significant part of the defense network. Lifeline for many local communities along the corridor.

Roadway geometry is constrained, with narrow shoulders and tight curves.

Improvements are needed to lessen delays . . . Respects the unique environmental, historic, community and recreational resources in Clear Creek County.
Core Values

- Safety
- Mobility and Accessibility
- Implementability
- Environment
- Community
- Engineering Criteria and Aesthetic Guidelines
- Sustainability
- Historic Context
- Decision Making
Critical Issues

• Emergency Response
• Reliability
• Recreation
• Natural Resources Including Wildlife
• Adherence to MOU
• Historical and Cultural Resources
• Adherence to ROD
Study Area and Technical Team Formation

Discuss the study area limits & outline the Technical Team
Meeting Schedule

Proposed Technical Team Meetings

- 12/5
- 12/8
- 12/12
Next Steps and Closing

- Action Items
- Homework
  - ID TT members
- Next PLT Meeting Date?
- Questions?
Westbound I-70 Mountain Corridor Concept Development Process

https://www.codot.gov/projects/i-70mountaincorridor/concept-development-process