

WB I-70 Concept Development Process

March 14, 2017 Public Meeting 1 Comments and Responses

revised 7/18/2017

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	Consider the Cross Section width of WB. Make sure the MOU is followed.	CDOT has been working with Clear Creek County and has developed an approach to be consistent with the Record of Decision (ROD) and also address safety issues as needed. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process will determine the cross-section to be used in each location.
2	Need AGS or some other rail transit	CDOT completed an Advanced Guideway System (AGS) Feasibility Study in August 2014. An AGS was determined to be technically feasible but no funding was identified. The NEPA process for highway improvements does not preclude a future AGS.
3	Eastbound should have included a full shoulder	This was considered but was not implemented because it would have cost too much and had more environmental impacts than other options. CDOT and FHWA will be working through a CSS process to determine what the appropriate shoulder width is for the WB project.
4	Consider three lanes and a shoulder lane	From the top of Floyd Hill to the Veterans Memorial Tunnels, a three lane section with a full shoulder is planned.
5	WB doesn't need to be three lanes the entire corridor, consider passing lanes	Passing lanes would not meet the travel demand (for peak periods) and fix the bottleneck issues at Floyd Hill.
6	Empire Junction is dangerous - Exit 232W signs get knocked down, replace signs promptly	Safety of the existing infrastructure is a critical part of purpose and need development in the NEPA process to be initiated right after this Concept Development Process. CDOT Maintenance quickly takes care of knocked down signs as they are notified of those problems.
7	EB express lane is dangerous due to trucks, speed, stopping, and foliage blocking vision	The accident history of the EB express lane is being examined and this information will be used during the upcoming NEPA process for the westbound improvements. Preliminary information is that accidents have decreased compared to the situation before the Mountain Express Lane was constructed.
8	Traffic Management - need to consider Evergreen, acceleration lanes, focus on weekends	The focus of this improvements is primarily on peak period traffic. Acceleration lanes from Evergreen could be considered during the subsequent NEPA process.
9	Bike Paths – tunnel under landslide at US 6; take out horseshoe	Improvements to the bike infrastructure from US 6 to Hidden Valley Interchange is included in the 2011 Record of Decision. The Clear Creek Greenway Plan also addresses improved bicycle facilities.
10	Improvements for rafting companies @ US 6 interchange	This will be considered in the subsequent NEPA process.
11	Economic Impacts –don't want Clear Creek County to become a pass through. Would like to see data on economic impacts of EB PPSL	Some businesses in Idaho Springs businesses have reported that business conditions have improved after the EB PPSL was constructed. Data on economics will be collected for the subsequent NEPA study.
12	Need data on: economics, environmental (air emissions), noise	Data on economics, air quality and noise for the existing condition and for the future 2040 condition will be developed and considered in the subsequent NEPA process.
13	Make sure to pay attention to the areas of special attention identified in the I-70 CSS documents.	The Areas of Special Attention will be incorporated into the upcoming NEPA processes.
14	Need frontage roads and passing lanes – Central City Pkwy to bottom of Floyd Hill	The ROD commits to a frontage road between the bottom of Floyd Hill and Idaho Springs. The peak period traffic volumes are too high for passing lanes to address the problem.
15	Use real estate for highest and best use. Look at all opportunities for land use.	Land use will be a consideration in future NEPA studies.
16	Expand evaluation criteria specific to localities—include water, exit 247, emergency access	These evaluation criteria are included in the Concept Development work currently being done. They will also be included in future NEPA processes.
17	Interchange with US 6 near Mile Marker 244 is a problem	The problems with existing interchanges and possible ways to address those will be considered during the NEPA process.
18	Clear signage and instructional signage is needed	Signage will be added as needed, including speed limit signage.
19	Impact at top of Floyd hill due to closing US 6 – do not close US 6.	There are no plans to close US 6. Various changes to interchanges including the one at US 6 will be considering during the subsequent NEPA process.
20	Emergency access from neighborhoods – consider ingress/egress at the top of Floyd Hill	The NEPA process will analyze reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for WB I-70 improvements, including improvements to the interchange at the top of Floyd Hill. In the meantime, CDOT has graded in a second emergency access/egress point west of the Floyd Hill interchange.
21	Need access to I-70 for gamers/Casinos – this impacts Floyd Hill because traffic from the gaming areas affects residential traffic	Existing and future traffic from all destinations (such as gaming, recreational, residential) will be considered in the NEPA process.
22	Need assurance that concepts will comply with previous agreements – MOU/ROD	CDOT has been working with Clear Creek County to develop an approach consistent with the Record of Decision (ROD) and also address safety issues as needed. The NEPA process, corridor context and the CSS process will determine the cross-section to be used in each location.
23	Need noise mitigation east of Idaho Springs historic district	If it is determined to be needed, noise mitigation will be studied east of the historic district.
24	Geotechnical analysis needed early on, e.g. landslide	Geotechnical experts are involved in the Concept Development Process which is currently underway. They will also continue to be involved in the subsequent NEPA process.
25	Consider detours during construction and the effects of detours on truck traffic and gravel mine operations and traffic	Detours during construction will be considered during the NEPA process.
26	Need improved road closure information and residential traffic management	CDOT is continuing to develop improvements in traffic management and intelligent systems.
27	Wildlife Crossings need to be considered at Kermits and Two Bears	Wildlife crossings will be considered during the subsequent NEPA process.
28	Only one access/egress point from the four subdivisions that get access off MP 247. This is a problem.	CDOT has graded in a second emergency access/egress point for residents of the subdivisions that get access off MP 247.
29	Sight distance on frontage roads is a problem. Foliage needs to be managed.	Frontage roads are under the jurisdiction of Clear Creek County.
30	Need neighboring county support (Summit County).	Summit County is a member of the Project Leadership Team and the Technical Team.
31	The residents of Silver Lake in Lawson do not want this. Please build a beautiful greenway bike trail on the Northside of I70 from Dumont through Lawson. The bicycles use this already and have for many years.	We assume this comment is referring to the Greenway trail. The Clear Creek Greenway Authority finalized their plans in 2016 for the location of the Greenway trail. If you have comments, please contact Randall Navarro at 202-815-3461.
32	My concern is that you will spend a lot of money and the band aid fit will not be enough for the long-term growth of our state.	The Programmatic EIS looked out to the year 2050 for transportation improvements needed to respond to the growth of our state. The Programmatic EIS built in a process to include additional improvements over time as needed.
33	As a resident of Floyd Hill, I appreciate the effort CDOT is going through to improve I-70.	Comment noted.

WB I-70 Concept Development Process

March 14, 2017 Public Meeting 1 Comments and Responses

revised 7/18/2017

Comment #	Comment	Response
34	There is a great deal of support for your initiative to relieve the congestion on westbound 1-70. Residents in the area can't go out or get back home on many weekends because of the traffic jams.	This information will be reflected in the purpose and need statement prepared for the NEPA processes.
35	Need AGS	CDOT in August of 2014 completed the AGS Feasibility Study. It determined that AGS was technically feasible but there was no funding for its construction cost or operating costs. The highway improvements are being done in a manner that will not preclude future AGS.
36	During summer month of June/July 2016, our neighborhood was routinely gridlocked. For example, 30-60 minutes to high school from Hwy 40.	One of the main reasons these projects are being considered is to address the problems with traffic congestion.
37	For Floyd Hill residents—Concerns regarding fire: There are 1100 people who live in the area to the south of 1-70. The only way that any of these people can get out is via Homestead Road. That is the road that crosses the bridge over 1-70, at Exit 247. It has one lane outbound, as the Northbound lane would be needed for emergency vehicle access to the community. Evergreen Fire Rescue (EFR) has designated the Floyd Hill area at Exit 247 as one of the 4 Most Dangerous places in their protection area, due to characteristics such as: steepness of terrain, vegetation, density of population.	The NEPA process for the Floyd Hill project will consider the need for a second emergency access point as a part of its purpose and need. In addition, recently, CDOT has graded in a second emergency access/egress point for residents of the subdivisions that get access off MP 247.
38	For Floyd Hill residents—Need to improve emergency egress to protect community from fire.	The NEPA process for the Floyd Hill project will consider the need for a second emergency access point as a part of its purpose and need. In addition, recently, CDOT has graded in a second emergency access/egress point for residents of the subdivisions that get access off MP 247.
39	For Floyd Hill residents—Improve the safety for Floyd Hill residents wherever you can. This includes doing things like an emergency egress at Sawdust Court.	The NEPA process for the Floyd Hill project will consider the need for a second emergency access point as a part of its purpose and need. In addition, recently, CDOT has graded in a second emergency access/egress point for residents of the subdivisions that get access off MP 247.
40	Issue to Consider—Too much traffic from gaming area on US 6 and US 40	Existing and projected traffic from all sources will be considered as alternatives are developed during the NEPA process.
41	Issue to Consider—Improvements on CO Blvd and on I-70 will help property values in Idaho Springs	Comment noted.
42	Issue to Consider—What will be the impact to mobile homes in Idaho Springs?	This will be considered as a part of the NEPA process that occurs after this Concept Development process. The NEPA process requires a full analysis of right-of-way, noise, and visual impacts which will include any impacts to mobile homes in Idaho Springs
43	Issue to Consider—Quality of life should be a priority	Effects to quality of life will be considered during the NEPA process
44	Issue to Consider—Locals should not have to pay a toll	CDOT is not considering tolling all lanes on I-70. There will be free lanes just like there are now for the EB direction.
45	Issue to Consider—My family owns the restaurant at Exit 244. I hope you take into consideration, the restaurant, rafting, and wildlife that are in the area.	Existing businesses, rafting and wildlife will all be taken into consideration as concepts are developed during the subsequent NEPA process.
46	Issue to Consider—Will improving access to this area increase the congestion?	Adding access (a new interchange) typically degrades mobility on the interstate. Improving access (making changes to an existing interchange) typically improves mobility.
47	Issue to Consider—Major concern for Floyd Hill residents: Safety, egress and evacuation.	The NEPA process for the Floyd Hill project will consider the need for a second emergency access point as a part of its purpose and need. In addition, recently, CDOT has graded in a second emergency access/egress point for residents of the subdivisions that get access off MP 247.
48	Issue to Consider—Avoid moving US 6 ramp traffic to Floyd Hill. Increasing traffic would pose traffic and safety issues for our community.	Increased traffic and safety issues will be considered during the NEPA process.
49	Issue to Consider—Traffic Noise Reduction and Visual Enhancements needed.	The NEPA process will consider impacts to noise levels and visual character.
50	Issue to Consider—Concerns relative to the specific locale around Exit #247. Decision Criteria seems to take into account greater regional needs, but does not indicate an understanding of specific concerns.	The local factors we are considering at this location are emergency access, land use, public safety, future recreational access, conflicts with trucks and residential traffic.
51	Issue to Consider—Criteria need to be added to decision matrix, specific to the needs of people who live at Exit 247. Additional criterion about public safety in the area, in case of the need for an emergency evacuation	The local factors we are considering at this location are emergency access, land use, public safety, future recreational access, conflicts with trucks and residential traffic.
52	Issue to Consider—Reevaluate several of the other criteria, particularly #2 and #7, as they impact the local considerations on Floyd Hill	The local factors we are considering at this location are emergency access, land use, public safety, future recreational access, conflicts with trucks and residential traffic.
53	Issue to Consider—The return on investment does not justify this project. There are more long-term investments worthy of taxpayer money.	The findings relative to the benefit provided for the cost of improvements for the recently completed Mountain Express Lane is that it was very cost-effective (I-70 Eastbound Peak Period Shoulder Lane TIGER Application, CDOT April 2014.)
54	Issue to Consider—The money used on this project should have been invested in a train instead.	CDOT studied the AGS system and found that it is technically feasible but there is no funding to build or operate it at this time.
55	Issue to Consider—Need speed limit enforcement in the WB PPSL. There is currently no enforcement on EB. People drive way too fast. Currently the PPSL width does not support law enforcement vehicles to enforce speed limit.	Speed limit enforcement is the purview of the State Patrol. CDOT will discuss more frequent speed enforcement with the State Patrol.
56	Issue to Consider—Need signage to deter speeding in the WBPPSL. People using these "express" lanes are jeopardizing local motorist safety.	Signage will be added as needed, including speed limit signage.

WB I-70 Concept Development Process

March 14, 2017 Public Meeting 1 Comments and Responses

revised 7/18/2017

Comment #	Comment	Response
57	Issue to Consider—As a commercial shuttle operator, we could use better information on communications and safety closures. We had 15 vehicles in Silverthorne with passengers and no idea when the road might re-open. We could not make any decisions on what to do and when we did the road opened without warning.	CDOT has upgraded their intelligent highway systems along I-70 to help better respond to these needs. These upgraded systems will better inform users of road conditions in the future.
58	Issue to Consider—Concerns about water supplies – is there enough water to support the urban sprawl that will come with adding capacity?	This question is a land use question which is better answered by the local agency, which in this case is Clear Creek County. CDOT has no authority over local land use decisions.
59	Issue to Consider—Big horn sheep and river conservation.	Big horn sheep and river conservation will both be considered in the subsequent NEPA process.
60	Issue to Consider—May need to discuss a wildlife passage in Segment 1 depending on alignment.	The need for wildlife passages will be considered during the NEPA process for Segment 1.
61	Issue to Consider—Restore Clear Creek	The project team will look for opportunities to restore Clear Creek, however it is unlikely WB improvements will impact Clear Creek.
62	Design Solution to Consider—Connection to Jefferson County 65 will increase traffic.	Traffic impacts of all changes in transportation infrastructure will be considered during the NEPA process.
63	Design Solution to Consider—Add "on-ramp" on South side of bridge at Exit 247 off existing alignment will provide best finished highway and the least amount of congestion during construction.	This will be considered during the NEPA process.
64	Design Solution to Consider—Straightening curves will reduce accidents.	There is a correlation between tight curves and accidents. The subsequent NEPA process will include looking at opportunities to straighten curves.
65	Design Solution to Consider—Lessen the grade of hill from Exit 247 to Exit 244.	Alternatives will be considered in the NEPA process to lessen the grade of the road.
66	Design Solution to Consider—Limit big trucks to non-peak hours.	The motor carrier's groups are involved in these projects and will continue to work with CDOT to limit their traffic impacts.
67	Design Solution to Consider—Cantilever a highway to double tier it to add 2 additional lanes.	Cantilevering the highway similar to what was done in Glenwood Canyon is one of the design solutions that will be considered in the subsequent NEPA process.
68	Design Solution to Consider—Make mass-transit system -- Monorail.	CDOT studied the AGS mass transit system. It is technically feasible but there is no funding to build or operate it.
69	Design Solution to Consider—Offer more buses like Front Range Ski Bus.	The CDOT Bustang service has been recently increased and it is likely to be further increased as needs grow and if funding is available.
70	Design Solution to Consider—Need more passing lanes.	During peak periods, the traffic volumes indicate the need for a new lane. Passing lanes would not address the need.
71	Design Solution to Consider—Have peak lane open more often.	Because the Eastbound Mountain Express Lane is an interim project, the Federal Highway Administration and CDOT have agreed on maximum times the peak period shoulder lane can be open.
72	Design Solution to Consider—Design lanes wide enough to allow smooth traffic flow rather than what you did for Eastbound. Don't just repaint the line and say you added a lane. Give enough room for safe on and off exit-ramps.	The 2011 ROD set limits on what could be considered prior to 2020 in this section of the I-70 corridor. CDOT is working through the CSS process to develop recommendations that are safe but also remain an interim fix to address peak congestion needs until additional capacity can be added.
73	Design Solution to Consider—The roundabout on the north side of Exit 247 is a good idea; there is no need for an off-ramp at Exit 247	Modifications to interchanges will be considered during the subsequent NEPA process.
74	Design Solution to Consider—There is some land between this proposed roundabout and the building just to the west, signed as Marte. This land was intended to be parcels 2 and 3 of an overall PUD project, of which the Marte building was the first. There are several acres included in these parcels. However, there was an agreement not to develop parcels 2 & 3 until there was a supply of public water available; that supply now looks extremely unlikely, so these parcels cannot currently be developed. If they could be acquired, they could be used for a parking/staging area for trucks during emergency winter closures. This parking/staging area could be tied into either US-40 and/or the roundabout. Furthermore, this area could be used in the summer as parking and a trail-head for the land just above it that was just acquired jointly by the Jefferson County and Clear Creek County Open Space Commissions. This might help with a number of issues: improving traffic flow in general; managing the trucks, particularly in the winter; keeping the trucks and other traffic from congesting emergency egress routes on the south side; and providing value to the community for use of its open space.	Potential partnerships such as this can be considered and further explored during the subsequent NEPA process.
75	Design Solution to Consider—At exit 247, follow the principle that has evolved over years of study: keep as much of the congestion (development, trucks and other traffic, etc.) as possible on the NORTH side of I-70.	CDOT has no authority over local land use decisions. The improvements for WB I-70 will be focused on I-70 (rather than north or south of I-70) except as needed to address tight curves.
76	Design Solution to Consider—Do not ignore the county memorandum that stated NOT to have a full diamond interchange at this exit.	The NEPA process will address county planning documents.
77	Design Solution to Consider—Do not mix trucks and school buses.	There is no policy available to control mixed traffic use on an interstate.
78	Design Solution to Consider—Do not put a roundabout on the south side of I-70, or anything else that would impede the emergency egress of residents.	Interchange and intersection improvements will be considered more fully during the subsequent NEPA process.
79	Segment 1 Design (Top of Floyd Hill to VMT)—There will be more traffic noise if I-70 is elevated	Effects of traffic noise will be considered in the upcoming NEPA process.
80	Segment 1 Design (Top of Floyd Hill to VMT)—Object to two diamond interchanges at Exit 247 and 248	Interchange and intersection improvements will be considered more fully during the subsequent NEPA process.
81	Segment 1 Design (Top of Floyd Hill to VMT)—Should tunnel under the landslide. It straightens curves and eliminates the bridge issues at US 6	This was considered during the Programmatic EIS and the recently completed design speed study. This idea offers no mobility benefits when compared to a cheaper design, is less desirable from a safety perspective because of the speed differentials and would be more expensive and impactful to construct and maintain.

WB I-70 Concept Development Process

March 14, 2017 Public Meeting 1 Comments and Responses

revised 7/18/2017

Comment #	Comment	Response
82	Moving US 6 interchange to Floyd Hill area—Inappropriate to the traveling public - It would take them far out of the direction in which they are traveling. Travelers going westbound from US-6 would have to go 3 or 4 miles out of their way, and then backtrack the same amount. They would also have to climb 800 feet of altitude, just to descend the hill to where they started.	This will be further considered during the NEPA process.
83	Moving US 6 interchange to Floyd Hill area—It is an anathema to the residents of Floyd Hill - It would draw traffic congestion just where they do not want it. It would further endanger people in case of an emergency evacuation.	This will be further considered during the NEPA process.
84	Moving US 6 interchange to Floyd Hill area—Find a way to create a full movement interchange from US-6 onto both eastbound and westbound I-70 at or near the current location of Exit 244. Do not move any part of this interchange to exit 243 or 247, as that would be inconsistent with many things, including: the specific guidance from the county, the safety of people on Floyd Hill, the consideration of highway travelers, who would be taken far out of their direction of travel.	Development of interchange modifications will be more fully considered during the NEPA process.
85	Moving US 6 interchange to Floyd Hill area—Add criteria in your decision matrix specifically relevant to the needs and safety concerns for people who live at the specific exits where you are considering modifications.	Safety is one of the evaluation criteria for this process and will continue to be for the upcoming NEPA process. Neighborhood issues will be also be considered during the NEPA process.
86	Segment 2 Design (Idaho Springs)—PPSL must have wider shoulders and better sight distance than EB does	The width of shoulders will be determined during the NEPA process through a CSS design.
87	Segment 2 Design (Idaho Springs)—Build bridges off line	This is being considered, particularly in Segment 1.
88	Segment 2 Design (Idaho Springs)—CC Parkway to US 6 should be considered a frontage road	A frontage road between Central City Parkway and US 6 is an improvement that is committed to in the ROD.
89	Segment 2 Design (Idaho Springs)—Need more parking in Idaho Springs	If parking is impacted due to the project, it will be mitigated. The City is working with CDOT on a plan to put in the parking garage.
90	Segment 2 Design (Idaho Springs)—Acceleration ramp from SH 103 to EB is too short	CDOT is aware of this issue and looking into ways to address it.
91	Segment 2 Design (Idaho Springs)—On the 1900 block of Miner St – we’ve been asking CDOT for a noise wall for 35 years. At exit 239 – the RR tie wall – how will it be impacted?	Noise abatement (if determined to be needed) will be a part of the subsequent NEPA process. If the RR tie wall is impacted, it or another wall will be added in the same location.
92	Segment 2 Design (Idaho Springs)—On the 2000 block of Miner St – the concern is the footprint behind the houses and what kind of impact or treatment will be provided	Effects to area behind the houses in Idaho Springs will be considered during the NEPA process.
93	Segment 2 Design (Idaho Springs)—Are the EB lanes required width by state law – they seem too narrow. So will WB be the legal width?	The improvements will be designed in a context sensitive manner. FHWA determines if any variances to normal interstate standards are acceptable
94	Segment 2 Design (Idaho Springs)—On the 400 block of Idaho there was a previous agreement with the property owner to not impact any additional property. How will this be dealt with?	One of the key factors in the NEPA process in the vicinity of Idaho Springs will be to minimize any new right-of-way needs.
95	Segment 2 Design (Idaho Springs)—The design of the SH 103 bridge is an accident waiting to happen. Visibility for off ramp drivers is terrible. Need to almost get into oncoming traffic to see adequately.	CDOT is aware of this issue and looking into ways to address it.
96	Segment 2 Design (Idaho Springs)—Would eventually like to see metering of traffic as it is with E-470 and/or west of the EJMT tunnel – when only a certain number of cars may pass. That way with continued new residents of Colorado the I-70 E/W can continue to carry traffic	CDOT conducted some experiments with speed harmonization and the benefits were not clear. This could be considered in the future
97	Segment 3 Design (Empire Junction to west of Idaho Springs)—Greenway should be on the north side of I-70 where bicyclists have been riding for years	The location of the Greenway has been finalized by the Greenway Authority. If you have further questions, please contact 202-815-3461.
98	Segment 3 Design (Empire Junction to west of Idaho Springs)—The Greenway could come up Stanley Road, cross I-70 at the overpass at Dumont then continue west along the north side of I-70 past Lawson.	The location of the Greenway has been finalized by the Greenway Authority. If you have further questions, please contact Randall Navarro at 202-815-3461.
99	Segment 3 Design (Empire Junction to west of Idaho Springs)—Need new bridge over to the frontage road from Fall River Road	This will be considered during the NEPA process.
100	Segment 3 Design (Empire Junction to west of Idaho Springs)—Need new access to Fall River Road	This will be considered during the NEPA process.
101	Segment 3 Design (Empire Junction to west of Idaho Springs)—Need to control speed to be more consistent – recommend speed signs to harmonize	Signage over all lanes was considered for the eastbound lanes but was not put in because it was too visually obtrusive. It could be considered in the future.
102	Segment 3 Design (Empire Junction to west of Idaho Springs)—The cross section of Eastbound is dangerous at MP 234	Safety data from the EB PPSL is being evaluated to be used on the upcoming NEPA processes.
103	Construction Feedback—Residents in Idaho Springs were experiencing deteriorating air quality during Eastbound construction with 10 – 12 black top trucks present.	Ways to address potential air quality impacts during construction will be considered during the NEPA process.
104	Construction Feedback—Use recycled pavement in road base.	Contractors frequently choose to use recycled pavement during construction. CDOT has specifications that encourage this.
105	Construction Feedback—Construction went on for too long.	Trying to minimize the disruption to travelers and communities during construction is one of the main aims of these projects.
106	Construction Feedback—A third party contractor installing fiber optic line was allowed to construct all night and noise was a real issue.	Minimizing noise during construction and especially at night will be considered during the NEPA process.

WB I-70 Concept Development Process

March 14, 2017 Public Meeting 1 Comments and Responses

revised 7/18/2017

Comment #	Comment	Response
107	Construction Feedback—Noise from rumble strips Eastbound during construction and currently on MP 234 on Segment 3 is bad.	Minimizing noise during construction will be considered during the NEPA process.
108	Construction Feedback—What is the plan to keep I-70 open during construction?	Traffic management plans to minimize impacts during construction will be developed during the NEPA and final design processes.