

Meeting Notes



I-70 Floyd Hill to Veterans Memorial Tunnels

Date: October 31, 2018

Location: CDOT – Golden

ITF – Frontage Road Alignment

[Ctrl +Click HERE or paste link below into your browser for Shared Floyd Hill Project GDrive](#)

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B5g5iHKBVK6OR2tpb1J0OUNkNU0>

Welcome and Introductions

Neil Ogden, CDOT, welcomed the ITF participants. Self-introductions followed.

Design Review

Anthony Pisano, Atkins, distributed plan views and cross sections of the two frontage road alignments to review with the ITF: Frontage Road North and Frontage Road South. Some discussion highlights around the plans included:

- The **Frontage Road North** alignment will cross the creek just east of the Hidden Valley Interchange.
- The **Frontage Road South** alignment will cross the creek about 3,700 ft east of the Hidden Valley interchange. In addition, the US 6 flyover ramp will also cross the creek. This will require a longer flyover (1,070 feet long, 20-22 feet above interstate). This would be an additional creek crossing compared to the North alignment.
- When considering creek crossings, it is more than just the road crossing the creek; important to consider shading of the creek (i.e. if the crossing is lower, there will be more shading). Higher bridges allow for more light on the creek.
- Higher bridges may have more impact on aesthetics and visibility of the highway than a lower bridge.
- The group reviewed the US 6 / I-70 movements. They are the same under both options. The group discussed other issues related to the Hidden Valley and US 6 interchanges, but neither affects the frontage road options.
 - **Q:** How would Frei quarry trucks get off at US 6 and head east? **A:** Trucks would use EB on ramp (is under bridge in diagram)

- At the last Central City Council meeting, Council members discussed modifying the signal timing to reduce the wait time to get onto the Central City on-ramp. The signal timing at the interchange will be modified to fit with the new design.
ACTION: CDOT to follow up with Central City, Sam Hoover, on this topic to ensure signal timing is integrated into project design.
- The discussion began to raise design questions that are not related to the frontage road alignment discussion. The ITF agreed to refocus on the North and South Frontage Road options and hold additional design questions around mainline I-70 for a later time.
ACTION: CDOT/Atkins will come back in the November meeting with traffic results and intersection designs to answer specific design questions.

Environmental Surveys Relevant to Frontage Road alignment discussion

Mandy Whorton, Peak Consulting, reviewed and updated the ITF on environmental surveys relevant to the Frontage Road discussion:

1. The wetland delineation through this section has indicated that there are waters of the US in this area (Clear Creek), but no wetlands are present (vegetation is limited due to the rip-rap installed in this area).
2. The historic railroad grade for the former Colorado Central Railroad is coincident with the Greenway through this area.
3. The Greenway Plan is silent on the specific alignment of the Greenway in this area or how to integrate the Greenway with the Frontage Road. However, the Greenway Plan was developed before a frontage road was planned, and the Greenway design was intended to accommodate emergency vehicles largely because there is no frontage road in this location.
4. Visual impacts. The staff has not developed a full visual assessment. The next step of this assessment will be to identify key points of potential visual changes that the group is interested in analyzing further, preparing simulations, and evaluating the degree and intensity of visual changes.

The ITF members suggested that visual simulations would be helpful in evaluating the frontage road options, as it is difficult to trace lanes, flyovers, elevations on static maps and plots or to understand the tradeoffs between the various changes to the visual quality of the area (e.g., the rock cuts vs. the Greenway).

The Project Staff notes that we will be producing additional visuals so the ITF/TT can provide feedback on (1) what are the important/sensitive viewpoints to analyze and (2) from whose perspective (i.e. driver, rafter, pedestrian, etc)?

ACTION: Project Staff to continue to work on visualizations for review in 2019.

Frontage Road Alignment Matrix Review

Clear Creek County representatives ask that the group not go through the matrix; from their community perspective, the North alignment is the community preference. When the TT was originally providing input into mainline interchange and alignment options, it was with the assumption that the Frontage Road would remain on the north side of the creek. For the record, Clear Creek County representatives believe that community and environmental values and opportunities are compromised by the Frontage Road South alignment.

Holly Huyck noted that the matrix process ensures that community and design input is properly documented for NEPA and suggested that the group continue on with populating the matrix. It is also part of the CSS process that everyone is participating in. Project Staff concurred and the ITF agreed to move forward with the matrix discussion.

Clear Creek County representatives noted that the County would rather have a better long term solution than save 6 months of rock blasting and related impacts of traffic.

Clear Creek County has purchased the landlocked properties along the Greenway so access to these properties from the frontage road is not needed. The purchased land provides opportunities for recreational amenities associated with the Greenway.

Clear Creek County representatives also noted that if constructability and funding are the issues with the Frontage Road North alignment, we should talk about that as a constraint, instead of looking at all of the different categories. How will we address constructability and funding?

The Greenway and creek are more compatible in proximity than either is with the frontage road (i.e., it is desirable to have the frontage road as far as possible from both the Greenway and the creek).

The matrix discussion and comments can be found in the attached document.

The ITF also noted the following items will also need further discussion/evaluation:

- Icy bridges – are fewer bridges better to improve safety?
- Fire risk – cigarettes, firecrackers, catalytic converters, and increased access to additional area south of the creek may lead to increased fire risk
- Proximity to potential historic resources
- MOT impacts based on contractor input
- South side alignment as a “fatal flaw” for the Clear Creek County community
 - **ACTION:** Jo Ann Sorensen to document a fatal flaw description/analysis for Matrix row #10
- Environmental impacts: short-term gain versus long-term impact
- TT review of the mainline interchange/alignment options for this segment. Had the TT known that the mainline alignment/interchange option would result in the

Frontage Road South alignment, they may have had different input/recommendations when the mainline alignment and interchange options were discussed.

- While the ITF understood that the frontage road discussion was intentionally separated from the other, larger design options, such as the WB tunnel options, the impact of those other design elements were not understood and appear to have a greater impact than expected on the Greenway and creek.
- The ITF suggested taking another look at the mainline options for this section and how they might affect the frontage road alignments.
- Anthony and Kevin both explained that in a design process, it is not unusual to have iterative discussions as different issues are identified.

Attendees

Cindy Neely, Jo Ann Sorensen, Tim Mauck (Clear Creek County); Andy Marsh, Mike Hillman (Idaho Springs); Amy Saxton (CCGA); John Muscatell, Bill Coffin (Community); Holly Huyck (Clear Creek Watershed); Sam Hoover (Central City); Mike Raber (Clear Creek Bikeway User Group); Gary Frey (Trout Unlimited); Kelly Babeon (Clear Creek Fire); Tracy Sakaguchi (CMCA); Martha Tableman (Clear Creek County Open Space District); Wendy Koch (Town of Empire); Kevin Brown, Lauren Boyle, Neil Ogden, Vanessa Henderson, Stephen Harelson (CDOT); Mandy Whorton (Peak Consulting); Anthony Pisano (Atkins); Kevin Shanks (THK); Gina McAfee (HDR); Taber Ward (CDR Associates)