

I-70 MOUNTAIN CORRIDOR REASSESSMENT
Step 5: Documentation of the 2020 Reassessment

ATTACHMENT 1
I-70 Mountain Corridor 2020 Reassessment Work Plan
(amended May 27, 2020)

Collaborative Effort
Record of Decision 2020 Reassessment
Work Plan

As stated in the 2011 Record of Decision (ROD), the Preferred Alternative is “...a multimodal solution and includes three main components identified by the Collaborative Effort Team: 1) Non-infrastructure Components, 2) the Advanced Guideway System, and 3) Highway Improvements” (ROD 2011 pg. 2).

The 2020 Language (ROD 2011 pg. 8)

“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.”

Purpose and Need (Final Programmatic Impact Statement [PEIS] 2011 pg. ES-4)

“The purpose for transportation improvements is to increase capacity, improve accessibility and mobility, and decrease congestion for travel demand (projected to occur in 2050) to destinations along the I-70 Mountain Corridor as well as for interstate travel, while providing for and accommodating environmental sensitivity, community values, transportation safety, and ability to implement the proposed solutions for the Corridor.”

Primary Roles and Responsibilities

The following are the primary roles and responsibilities for the reassessment. Any specific roles and responsibilities for a given step are listed within the steps.

1. The Collaborative Effort’s (CE) highest goal is consensus. A consensus agreement is one that all group members can support, built by identifying and exploring all parties’ interests and by developing an outcome that satisfies these interests to the greatest extent possible.
2. The CE will strive to build consensus around which criteria and key considerations will be used to reassess the overall purpose and need and effectiveness of the implementation of the components of the Preferred Alternative.
3. The CE will strive to build consensus around revisions, if any, to the Preferred Alternative.
4. The FHWA and CDOT commit to fully engaging as partners in this process and being an integral part of reaching consensus. However, lead agencies cannot delegate their responsibilities regarding decision making and NEPA compliance. As equal and participating members of the CE, lead agencies are committed to crafting with all stakeholders decisions that can be supportive.

If consensus is not possible, then the level of support and dissension will be noted and all deliberations and products of the CE will be considered by the lead agencies in their decision making.

5. The CE ROD Reassessment Subcommittee is tasked by the CE to act as the working group, to carry out task specific roles and responsibilities listed within the steps. The CE subcommittee will regularly report to the CE. The CE will provide guidance to the subcommittee at any time while they carry out their specific tasks.
6. The CE subcommittee members are obligated to be transparent and will proactively communicate results to the CE. This includes narratives, listed in the steps below, to be submitted to the CE via email with a 2-week comment period. The subcommittee will work together to address the comments and if some are not solvable, a CE meeting may be called.
7. The obligation of the CE members is to actively participate. They review the narrative summaries distributed by the subcommittee to gain understanding. It is intended that each step leading to the preparation of the reassessment is the time for the CE to build consensus. The CE may call special meetings at any time for discussion to help build consensus.
8. CDOT leads analysis/prepares documentation, with oversight from FHWA.

Step 1: Reassess the Purpose and Need. If this proposed process identifies substantial changes in the I-70 Mountain Corridor that alter the Purpose and Need of the Final PEIS/ROD the work plan does not automatically progress to Step 2. The group will reconvene to determine next steps.

Roles and Responsibilities - CE ROD Reassessment Subcommittee provides input and feedback to evaluation criteria. CE reviews written narrative summary to gain understanding on any changes in context and/or purpose and need.

Deliverables - Written narrative of context evaluation, written narrative of Purpose and Need evaluation, and discussion at CE meetings.

Schedule – List of trends and relevant factors discussion in January 2020, Draft analysis complete in May 2020, and Final analysis complete in September 2020.

Step 1A: Evaluation of context. Determine if the context in which the Purpose and Need statements were developed have changed. Information that may be needed to evaluate the context includes:

1. Population
2. Land use and land use pressures (including demand)
3. Technology
4. Climate change
5. Others

Step 1B: Evaluate current components of Purpose and Need. Determine if the components are still valid using Step 1A context evaluation. The same data sets (listed under each component) must be used as were used in the original PEIS to provide a true comparison.

Component 1: Increase capacity. Information that may be needed to evaluate this component includes:

1. Existing traffic data
2. Person trips

3. Updated traffic projections/Travel Demand Model information
4. Transit ridership
5. Others

Component 2: Improve mobility and accessibility. Information that may be needed to evaluate this component includes:

1. Travel time/reliability
2. Safety data
3. Incident response times
4. Travel Demand Model information
5. Others

Component 3: Decrease congestion. Information that may be needed to evaluate this component includes:

1. Level of Service
2. Crash data, Weighted Hazard Index (WHI) information
3. Travel time/reliability
4. Travel Demand Model information
5. Others

Step 2: Assess the effectiveness of the implementation of components of the Preferred Alternative.

This includes discussion on the Minimum and Maximum Programs of Improvements in the Preferred Alternative and the specific Tier 2 improvements implemented to date, as well as the remaining improvements under the Minimum and Maximum Programs.

Roles and Responsibilities - CE ROD Reassessment Subcommittee provides input and feedback to how effectiveness will be measured. CE reviews written narrative summary to gain understanding on assessment of effectiveness.

Deliverables - Written narrative and discussion at CE meetings.

Schedule - Initial input into Step 2A and Step 2B in January 2020, additional discussion/initial analysis in May 2020, Draft analysis complete in September 2020, and Final analysis complete in December 2020.

Step 2A: Determine how to measure/assess effectiveness.

This will include an evaluation against the Purpose and Need and may include other factors as recommended by the subcommittee. Data collection will be needed such as:

- Travel time before and after implementation of an improvement
- Incident response times before and after implementation of an improvement
- Transit ridership before and after implementation of an improvement
- Person/vehicle capacity of surrounding area before and after implementation of an improvement
- How well have we been providing for and accommodating community values and environmental sensitivity (qualitative)
- Others

Step 2B: Assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the Preferred Alternative to date along with the remaining elements of the Minimum and Maximum Programs of Improvements/Preferred Alternative, timing, and anticipated effects. CDOT leads analysis, with oversight from FHWA. This section is taken directly from the ROD to show the exact components as listed.

Components of the Preferred Alternative.

- 1) Non-Infrastructure Related Components
- 2) Advanced Guideway System (AGS)
- 3) Highway Improvements

Minimum Program of Improvements. The non-infrastructure related components, AGS, specific highway improvements, and other highway projects comprise the Minimum Program of Improvements.

“Non-Infrastructure Related Components – Non-infrastructure-related components can begin in advance of major infrastructure improvements to address some of the issues in the Corridor today. Some of these components require actions and leadership by agencies, municipalities, and other stakeholders beyond the lead agencies. The Tier 1 decision includes non-infrastructure-related components that could be carried out with federal involvement in a Tier 2 NEPA process. Other non-infrastructure components, including those identified below and others not listed, could be carried out without federal involvement and would not require a Tier 2 NEPA process. When entities advance these strategies without federal involvement, for example, if the I-70 Coalition (a coalition of Corridor governments) were to implement travel demand management strategies for increasing overnight stays in the Corridor, Tier 2 NEPA processes would not be required. The non-infrastructure strategies include, but are not limited to:

- Increased enforcement
- Bus, van, or shuttle service in mixed traffic
- Programs for improving truck movements
- Driver education
- Expanded use of existing transportation infrastructure in and adjacent to the Corridor
- Use of technology advancements and improvements to increase mobility without additional infrastructure
- Traveler information and other information technology systems
- Shift passenger and freight travel demand by time of day and day of week
- Convert day trips to overnight stays
- Promote high-occupancy travel and public transportation
- Convert single-occupancy vehicle commuters to high-occupancy travel and/or public transportation
- Implement transit promotion and incentives
- Other transportation demand management measures to be determined

Advanced Guideway System – An Advanced Guideway System is a central part of the Preferred Alternative and includes a commitment to the evaluation and implementation of an Advanced Guideway System within the Corridor, including a vision of transit connectivity beyond the study area and local accessibility to such a system. Additional

information is necessary to advance implementation of an Advanced Guideway System in the Corridor:

- Feasibility of high-speed rail passenger service
- Potential station locations and local land use considerations
- Transit governance authority
- Alignment
- Technology
- Termini
- Funding requirements and sources
- Transit ridership
- Potential system owner/operator
- Interface with existing and future transit systems
- Role of an Advanced Guideway System in freight delivery both in and through the Corridor

Highway Improvements – The Preferred Alternative includes highway improvements to address current Corridor conditions and future demands. These improvements will be planned taking into consideration all elements of the Preferred Alternative and local land use planning. The following safety, mobility, and capacity components are not listed in order of priority, are not subject to the parameters established for future capacity components, do not represent individual projects, and may be included in more than one description. They are listed in two categories: 1) “specific highway improvements” and 2) “other highway projects.” All of the improvements in both categories are included in the Minimum Program of Improvements. The specific highway improvements are called out specifically for the “triggers” for future highway and non-Advanced Guideway System transit improvements.

The specific highway improvements are:

- Six-lane component from Floyd Hill through the Twin Tunnels (milepost [MP] 243 to MP 247) including a bike trail and frontage roads from Idaho Springs to Hidden Valley and Hidden Valley to US 6
- Empire Junction (US 40 and I-70) interchange improvements (MP 232)
- Eastbound auxiliary lane from Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels to Herman Gulch (MP 215 to MP 218)
- Westbound auxiliary lane from Bakerville to the Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels (MP 215 to MP 221)

The other highway projects are:

- Truck operation improvements, such as pullouts, parking, and chain stations (multiple locations)
- Safety improvements west of Wolcott (MP 155 to MP 156)
- Safety and capacity improvements in Dowd Canyon (MP 170 to MP 173)
- Interchange improvements at the following locations:
 - Glenwood Springs (MP 116)
 - Frisco / Main Street (MP 201)
 - Gypsum (MP 140)
 - Frisco / SH 9 (MP 203)

- Eagle County Airport (part of No Action)
- Silverthorne (MP 205)
- Wolcott (MP 157)
- Loveland Pass (MP 216)
- Eagle & Spur Road (MP 147)
- Georgetown (MP 228)
- Edwards & Spur Road (MP 163)
- Downieville (MP 234)
- Avon (MP 167)
- Fall River Road (MP 238)
- Minturn (MP 171)
- Base of Floyd Hill / US 6 (MP 244)
- Vail West (MP 173) / Simba Run
- Hyland Hills (MP 247)
- Vail (MP 176)
- Beaver Brook (MP 248)
- Vail East (MP 180)
- Evergreen Parkway / SH 74 MP 252)
- Vail Pass (East Shrine Pass Road MP 190)
- Lookout Mountain (MP 256)
- Copper Mountain (MP 195)
- Morrison (MP 259)

Auxiliary lanes:

- Avon to Post Boulevard (Exit 168) (eastbound) (MP 167–MP 168)
- West of Vail Pass (eastbound and westbound) (MP 180–MP 190)
- Frisco to Silverthorne (eastbound) (MP 202.7–MP 205.1)
- Morrison to Chief Hosa (westbound) (MP 253–MP 259)” (ROD 2011 p. 3-5)

Maximum Program of Improvements. “To address long-term needs, additional highway capacity improvements were added to the Minimum Program of Improvements to comprise the Maximum Program of Improvements with the condition that prior to taking action to add capacity, the Collaborative Effort Team must review and consider certain triggers. The Maximum Program is comprised of all of the components of the Minimum Program plus six-lane capacity from the Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels to the Twin Tunnels, four additional interchange modifications in the Idaho Springs area, and a curve safety modification project at Fall River Road.” (ROD 2011 p. 7)

For the implementation status of the Preferred Alternative, see the attached table. (Note that this is being finalized and will be provided once a consultant team is selected.)

Step 3: Clarify uncertainties of the components of the Preferred Alternative. This section is not intended to add new information to the PEIS/ROD but rather to clarify questions on existing information.

Roles and Responsibilities - CE ROD Reassessment Subcommittee provides input and feedback on outstanding questions and how they will be evaluated. CE reviews written narrative summary to gain understanding on the questions and how they will be evaluated.

Deliverables - Written narrative to CE and discussion at CE meetings.

Schedule - List of outstanding questions determined in January 2020, Initial analysis complete in May 2020, and Final analysis complete in September 2020. Note this step may be able to be completed in one CE ROD Reassessment Subcommittee meeting and one CE meeting.

Step 3A: Identify outstanding questions regarding the Preferred Alternative, such as:

1. Status of Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels 3rd bore (clarify Minimum or Maximum Program)
2. Empire Interchange (clarify what is to be done in Minimum Program)
3. 2025 trigger
4. Clarify and restate the definition of AGS in the ROD
5. Maximum Program highway component definitions, including:
 - a. Future highway expansion needs to be considered independent of the MEXL projects
 - b. Capacity means people, not cars, and six-lane capacity is not the same as six-lane highway cross section
 - c. “Existing highway” could allow moving the highway from its current alignment, such as was considered in Idaho Springs visioning efforts
 - d. 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
 - e. Meaning of “not preclude” for AGS. Now that more information is known about the AGS alignment, need to consider how future highway projects might conflict with AGS.
6. Others

Step 3B: Evaluate/discuss outstanding questions regarding the Preferred Alternative.

Step 4: Develop list of potential future actions for continued pursuit of the Preferred Alternative. This section is not intended to add new information to the PEIS/ROD but rather to develop a list of potential future actions for continued pursuit of the Preferred Alternative. This list will be considered during the formal statewide planning process.

Roles and Responsibilities – CE brings forward considerations for future projects and initiatives. CDOT and FHWA will consider list of actions in formal statewide planning process. CE to discuss public involvement for this plan.

Deliverables – Listing of potential future actions for consideration developed at CE meeting.

Schedule – Initial discussion May 2020, prioritization in September 2020, Consensus Recommendation by December 2020. Note this step may be able to be completed in one or two longer CE workshop meetings.

Examples for consideration during Step 4:

- Update and expand on information in past studies (AGS 2014, ICS 2014, RMRA 2010)
- Analyze impact of Front Range Rail with AGS.
- Analyze technologies not studied in the past.
- Review risk & resiliency of the corridor including the potential effects of climate change.
- Program for improving truck movements.
- Analyze the data for change in GHG emissions for each technology assessed in the ROD and updates.
- Others

Step 5: Develop Reassessment Document. This step is intended provide a written summary of all steps above in a complete package. The obligation of the CE members is to actively participate. They review the narrative summaries distributed by the subcommittee to gain understanding. It is intended that each step leading to the preparation of the reassessment document is the time for the CE to build consensus, not to wait for this step to review all information and comment.

1. Develop Reassessment document.

Roles and Responsibilities – CDOT and FHWA prepare Reassessment document. If substantial changes from the ROD are realized, a public involvement process will be included.

Deliverables - Final Reassessment document

Schedule - Reassessment completed in December 2020.