

Meeting Notes



I-70 Floyd Hill to Veterans Memorial Tunnels

Date: January 24, 2017

Location: CDOT – Golden

Technical Team - Meeting #7

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

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

Introductions and Overview

Taber Ward, CDR Associates, welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. Self-introductions followed. No changes were made to the agenda and the meeting proceeded.

Outcomes from Meeting #6:

- Presented and Agreed on Purpose and Need
- Update on Context Consideration ITF
- Review and TT Input on Interchange Location Options
- Development of “Pros and Cons” lists for each Interchange Option

Project Updates

WB PPSL – The TT met for the 11th time on January 24th; a PLT meeting is being scheduled to provide process direction to the TT.

Fall River Road – A scoping meeting is planned for the end of January.

Vail Pass - A PLT was held on January 17th and the first TT meeting will be held in early February.

GeoHazard Mitigation – Work will begin on February 20th with bridge deck rehabilitation at bottom of Floyd Hill at Kermitts and the Soda Creek road in Jefferson County

Technical Team Schedule

The TT reviewed the Technical Team issues schedule. It was noted that the alternatives evaluation schedule has been added.

ITF Outcomes – Context Considerations

Kevin Shanks, THK Associates, outlined the process for incorporating input (public comments, TT, PLT and other) into the decision-making process. Kevin distributed a handout that included a new organization structure for the Context Considerations to better track input to decisions made. He noted that the charge of the Context Considerations ITF was to ‘do something’ with these comments and make them usable in the evaluation efforts, including defining the measures of success. However, the measures of success cannot be so specific that they point to only one alternative/answer.

Previously, the ITF had distilled the input into 23 Evaluation Questions related to Core Values and Critical Issues that would serve as the basis for tracking the comments. After further consideration, the ITF suggested a smaller number of questions and new Categories for the sake of clarity. The Evaluation Questions were narrowed to 18 and three new Categories were developed: 1) Items for a Different Process, i.e. outside the scope of this process 2) Design Checklist 3) Must Do. This is a living document that will be updated as necessary.

Following discussion of the organization of the input, Kevin distributed the revised CSS decision flow chart including the Context Statement, Core Values, Critical Issues, Evaluation Questions (Does the alternative...) and Measures of Success. The TT members discussed this and noted that a higher-level set of questions will be the primary tool for evaluation with the longer list of Context Considerations and questions as background.

Agreement: The TT indicated support for this approach and the ITF Recommendations. It was noted that this is still open for modification.

Q: Where does water quality (pg 4 of 6 – E9) fit into the measure of success, it doesn’t seem like what is shown here is sufficient? In looking at the Context Considerations and the matrix it is still not clear how the input connects to the measures of success.

“Accommodates SWEEP recommendations” as outlined is not enough. For wetlands, we also mention “Area of wetlands impacts” which also need to be added to Measures of Success, plus we need something like “enhances, water quality.” TT members asked other specific questions regarding how the input received related to the measures of success. The Project Staff encouraged the TT to provide additional comments prior to the next TT meeting on February 14th and to provide additional measures of success if needed, recognizing that the goal is to keep it brief and use the full list of comments as a reference document.

ACTION: TT members review and provide comment on the new organization of the context statements and how it has been translated into the document.

Interchange Location Options and Evaluation

Anthony Pisano, Atkins, reviewed the US 6 Access Interchange options including the existing movements along with alignment options (Existing and Option A – E). He reviewed the TT feedback regarding the pros/cons for each option (See document attached).

The goal of the interchange location option review was to determine the location of the interchanges and whether they will 1) be kept the same, 2) be changed by adding ramps and other features or 3) be changed by removing ramps and other features at those locations.

TT discussion notes on the Interchange Options included the following.

Option A

Q: Can the Greenway alignment be included on these diagrams? **A:** The Greenway will be on the south side of the river and the frontage road on the north side, in keeping with the Greenway Plan. There is not a lot of value in including this level of detail on these design maps.

Change the text from Pro - “Eliminate speed differentials from WB I70” to “**Reduces** speed differential.”

It was clarified that this is a big picture systems review, not an intersection issues review. Issues like a roundabout location will be examined during the design phase.

Option B

This option conflicts with the AGS alignment, it should be “tossed out” as a result.

Option C

Some TT comments included support for this option and others wondered about upgrading the CR 65 interchange with full movement. Anthony Pisano noted that once the traffic model is established the team will look at whether the traffic volume warrants a full interchange at CR 65. It was noted that if there was a full movement at CR65, it would handle Evergreen traffic.

Q: Is there a way to make an Option C1 that would look at this option (full movement at CR 65)?

This is a complicated option with expensive infrastructure and unknown impacts on other uses; visual/aesthetic impacts.

The ramps are confusing, TT members noted, but a full interchange is better for driver expectancy.

Add Pro – full interchange is better for driver expectancy.

Add Con – Visual impacts; Complicated design is confusing and worse for driver expectancy

Option D

Add Pro - More room for recreation; Removes EB truck traffic from US 40

Add Con - May overload Hidden Valley with traffic coming from CO93 – US6 and there may need to be improvements at Hidden Valley; Doesn't meet driver expectancy with half-diamond

It was observed that the only option that addresses Exits 247 and 248 is Option A. There may be improvements at those interchanges that may have benefit in circulation below. Anthony Pisano noted that everything in Option A could be added to the other options. In this evaluation of US 6 Access, it doesn't mean that other options are off the table as we progress in the evaluation. Once we evaluate the movements at the US 6 interchange, we can look again at Exits 247 but 248 using the traffic numbers.

Option E

Add Con - Impact to local streets; truck/ bike conflicts on US 40; out of direction for US 40

ACTION: Project Staff update the pro/con discussion list to refine the evaluation of the Floyd Hill concepts.

US 6 Access Options – Matrix Evaluation

The TT discussed the Evaluation Matrix and indicated that in the future it is better to have the Project Staff hand out a matrix with some words in it (no colors) prior to the meeting to give the TT time to review and digest the information for the in-meeting discussions. The Project Staff were encouraged by the TT to reconcile the terms used in the Evaluation Matrix with the terms used in the CSS Flow Chart and ITF Chart so that measures of success are consistent with the ITF language.

A generic high-level systems principle was articulated by the TT: Ensure that traffic remains on I-70 – do not displace traffic to local streets; let people go to where they want to go but direct regional traffic to the interstate.

The TT used the Evaluation Matrix to begin evaluating the options and cross referenced the Context Considerations with the evaluation criteria and measures of success.

Comments were recorded in real-time on the Evaluation Matrix (**see attached**). The TT confirmed that this detailed, deep dive into the Evaluation Process and Matrix is an important exercise and want to walk through the matrix cell-by-cell.

CDOT suggested that TT members attend the next Evaluation Matrix meeting as an ITF. The following TT members volunteered: Neil Ogden, Vanessa Henderson (CDOT); Mike Raber (Bikeway); Lynette Hailey (I-70 Coalition and Black Hawk); Mitch Houston (School Board); Tim Mauck (CCC); Anthony Pisano (Atkins); Kevin Shanks and Julie Gamec (THK).

A concern was mentioned that we need to know what the Hidden Valley interchange capacity is before we know how to rank Options D and E. Will the fleet mix make a difference? We need to make sure we consider RVs and loaded trucks. The turns are tight. If US 6 traffic comes in along the frontage road, will it work?

ACTION: Evaluation Matrix ITF to reconcile language between the ITF, CSS Flow Chart and Evaluation Matrix documents.

ACTION: CDR to schedule an ITF meeting to conduct an initial evaluation of the US 6 Access Options and provide that summary to the full TT.

Next Steps:

- US 6 Access Options – Interchange Evaluation Matrix ITF – **Set for February 1 from 9am – 12pm.**
- Project Staff will send a new matrix out to the TT on Feb 7. **Please review and comment on this one.**
- Roadway Design Option Locations and Evaluation
 - Top of Floyd Hill to US 6
 - US 6 to Hidden Valley
 - Hidden Valley to VMT
- Integrate Roadway Design Options and Interchanges

Actions and Agreements

ACTION: TT members review and provide comment on the new organization of the context statements and how it has been translated into the document.

ACTION: Project Staff update the pro/con discussion list to refine the evaluation of the Floyd Hill concepts.

ACTION: Evaluation Matrix ITF to reconcile language between the ITF, CSS Flow Chart and Evaluation Matrix documents.

ACTION: CDR to schedule an ITF meeting to conduct an initial evaluation of the US 6 Access Options and provide that summary to the full TT.

Attendees

Randy Wheelock, Tim Mauck, Cindy Neeley (Clear Creek County); Bill Coffin and John Muscatell (Community Reps from Floyd Hill); Lynette Hailey (I-70 Coalition); Sam Hoover (Central City); Mike Raber (CC Bikeway User Group); Tracy Sakaguchi (CMCA); Holly Huyck (CC Watershed Foundation), Amy Saxton (CCC Greenway); Mitch Houston (CCC School Board); Gary Frey (Trout Unlimited) Kelly Galardi (FHWA); Anthony Pisano, Carrie Wallis, Tyler Larson (Atkins); Gina McAfee (HDR Inc.); Kevin Shanks, Julie Gamec (THK Associates); Neil Ogden, Kevin Brown, Vanessa Henderson, Steve Harelson (CDOT); Taber Ward, Jonathan Bartsch (CDR Associates)