



PROJECT:	I-70 Frontage Road Improvement (Old US 40/CR 314)
PURPOSE:	PLT/TT #2.5
DATE/TIME HELD:	November 1, 2011: 9:00am – 12:00pm
LOCATION:	Idaho Springs City Hall – 1711 Miner Street, Idaho Springs, CO
ATTENDEES:	See sign in sheet

Meeting Minutes

1. Introductions

Ben Acimovic summarized discussions last week at PLT #2. Due to the heavy snowfall, there was limited turnout at PLT #2. Today’s presentation is similar to last week’s but has some additional information for clarification. No decisions last week, just discussion. CDOT is anticipating a \$6 million budget for Phase I for design and construction.

- Cancellation policy: if Clear Creek County schools are closed, PLT or other team meetings will be rescheduled.
- New PLT Members: John Rice and Suzen Raymond (representing rafting companies) and Captain Ron Prater with Colorado State Patrol.
- Self introductions of all participants.

2. Updates

- Frontage Road website
 - <http://www.coloradodot.info/projects/i70frontageroad-idahosprings>
 - New information on the website, find any errors or questions, please let us know
- Twin Tunnels open house comments
 - Some inconvenience now, better access later.
 - Provide survey data and bore tests from stakeholder,
 - Lease office and warehouse space for both projects,



- Emergency responders request for special access at the dirt road/doghouse bridge to avoid I70 congestion.
 - Relocates and water/sewer plans
 - Les's utility information and CDOT's pavement information – will share information with Clear Creek County. Right now we have hard copies of Les's information, but will request digital information.
 - Doghouse rail bridge sufficiency
 - Existing bridge not sufficient for detour loads. Can be posted for frontage road traffic. I-70 Twin Tunnels EA will identify improvements and Frontage Road will show options later this meeting.
 - Rick Beck (CCC) requested review of bridge inspection after detour is done to confirm sufficiency.
 - Greenway refinement process and GOCO grant opportunities
 - GoCo grants in the process. Enhancement grants requested mid November to December 1. Open Space and County Commissioner talked about applying for enhancement grants for a different project instead of this one.
 - Greenway is also completing a survey for this area. Frontage Road survey will be available around Thanksgiving.
 - Greenway Issue Task Force – schedule meeting via Doodle: Pete, Tim M., Marjorie, Cindy, Mary Jane, Bill Macy, and John Rice. Pete asked to have the Lancaster family invited also.
3. Project Work Plan and Public Information Plan review
- Elements for consideration and approval
 - Project Context Statement – Did we get this right and does the team agree with it? No comments were made. Frontage Road Context Statement endorsed by PLT.
 - Desired Outcomes- General discussion of complete design, which piece will be built first, and costs.
 - Revise first bullet:



JoAnn – do we want to look at how it is functioning at the end? How is the project improving the frontage road? Will add more detail about how frontage road will be improved.

Mayor Morgan wants to make sure it is clear CDOT is constructing just phase I not the entire corridor this summer. Maybe, replace the word “corridor” with Frontage Road in the first bullet. Be more specific so people know this doesn’t include entire corridor including Twin Tunnels project – just frontage road.

Conceptual design (30%) and environmental clearance for entire frontage road area. This will give CDOT an idea of constraints and conceptual costs.

- Teams and Roles

- Combined Project Leadership Team (PLT) and Technical Team (TT)
- Project staff includes consultants and CDOT.
- Issue Task Force (ITF): Forming an ITF for Greenway and Utilities. The SWEEP/ALIVE and Section 106 will coordinate with Twin Tunnels team since we are both working in the same resources/boundary for both.

- Public Involvement Plan

- Website and monthly newsletters will coordinate with Twin Tunnels when there are public opportunities to make sure we can clarify the difference between the two projects. This project is a CatEx and we typically don’t have public meetings, but will use what is already happening.
- Mayor agrees that it is really important to keep the Twin Tunnels and Frontage Road separate. Overlapping could cause problems with funding.
- Three outreach lists: 1) PLT and Technical Team members, 2) Staff members, and 3) interested stakeholders. Marjorie Bell and Tom Breslin would like to be added to the PLT member list.
- Conceptual design (approximately 30% plans) will be shared at December 1st Field Inspection Review (FIR). Digital plans will be



emailed November 18th. The PLT (including Clear Creek Engineering) will be invited to the FIR and have two weeks to review prior to meeting. FIR will be based on aerial and old survey – design will be revised with actual survey. Survey and aerial data will be provided to the County's mapping department.

- Mayor wants to know when utility coordination will occur so he can get a timeframe of how much time he has to look for grants for the city's utility project. Utility coordination in early December, after the FIR plans are available. City decisions and funding will probably have to occur by January – February. CDOT needs to know if city will or won't do the water/sewer project.
- Request for a combined calendar for twin tunnels, frontage road, and the greenway.
- Critical Path for IGA process – Janet and Cindy started it.
- Endorse the Process: After the team makes the requested changes, does this Work Plan / PI Plan include everything you want to see? PLT confirmed that it did. Revised Plan will be posted on the project website.

4. Twin Tunnels EA and I-70 Frontage Road Timing and Coordination

- Summary of steps and timing
 - Frontage Road Phase I – Open Fall 2012 (\$6 million)
 - Twin Tunnels improvements – along I-70 and use Frontage Road as Detour – Spring-Summer 2013
 - Detour traffic shall not be allowed to go on Eastern decision area. Detour tie ins to I-70 at old US 40 (doghouse bridge) and informal (illegal) access location east of twin tunnels and west of hill to reach Hidden Valley interchange.
 - Tim Mauck wants to know how the detour will affect traffic back-up and the lights at Hidden Valley. Twin tunnels design team will figure out how people will exit at eastern end – likely before exit 243. Interchange will be the same as it is now during the detour, but detour traffic will not be able to use entire length of frontage road – this will



be local access only. May use Uniformed Traffic Control (UTC) to enforce local access.

- Restoration of Phase I of Frontage Road after use as detour – Fall 2013
 - What improvements will be added at that time? Frontage Road PLT/TT will determine future cross sections for all of Phase II – this part of our process today and at upcoming meetings. Then the Twin Tunnels design will have to consider what has been decided. So, whatever the Twin Tunnels project disturbs, they have to fix it. Any commitments we make as part of this PLT will be coordinated with the Twin Tunnels.
- Frontage Rd Phase II – TBD based on funding. CDOT will be looking at internal funding opportunities and will support Clear Creek County in their pursuit of GOCO funds. .

5. Screening criteria

- Screening Criteria will be used to compare options for the Frontage Road. Initial criteria based on Idaho Springs ASA recommended criteria, but were modified to include PEIS and project specific suggestions
- Screening criteria categories are Mobility, Healthy Town, Environmental, and Sustainability
- PLT/TT has had an opportunity to review. Revisions to criteria or additional criteria to include:
 - Cultural resources will be added: potential 106 resources like the water line and Marjorie's house.
 - Traffic Data was presented
 - Thanks to Clear Creek County road and bridge for providing traffic data.
 - Projections do not assume a continuous frontage road to US6. If it doesn't include the ultimate connection to US-6 is the design good enough for the future? We could look at how much traffic will trigger LOS D in this scenario (sensitivity analysis). Concern that the traffic counts may not provide a realistic future use.



- Randy - Does this team vision a future 4-lane frontage road? At previous PLTs, representatives expressed the desire for the frontage road to remain a frontage road in nature – serving local traffic and remaining at similar speeds. Team has not evaluated a 4-lane frontage due to PLT direction and extreme physical constraints associated with 4-lane widening. Could evaluate if that was preferred by PLT – no it is not.
- Level of Service (LOS) discussions. If we go below LOS C, trigger for an Air Quality analysis. LOS is a measure of how well traffic is flowing and how much traffic it can handle. For a two lane road factors that affect LOS include: how wide are the lanes, adequate site lines, speed appropriate, shoulders wide enough. Existing frontage road with no improvements may end up with LOS D by 2035. With this project (widened shoulders and lanes), will end up with LOS C or better in 2035. Different cross sections may have different LOS.
- Rick asked about the Floyd Hill project – wouldn't the detour have to use the Frontage Road? Do we need to take that into consideration? If another project impacts the frontage road, then that other project will address those impacts.
- Concern with back up and LOW at signalized intersections at exit 243. Control Delay - if the average vehicle that pulls up has an average delay of 20-35 seconds is LOS C during peak hour – that is the goal. On heavy traffic weekends, when cut through traffic uses the frontage road - how comfortable do you want to make it? Might want to make it less desirable so people will stay on I-70 instead of getting off on the frontage road. Need to define the peak intersection LOS goal.

6. Review cross section options and “decision areas”

- During PLT #1 and #2 meetings, team was directed keep the character of frontage road similar to existing conditions. Similar geometry and provide improved pavement and lane/shoulder widths. This led the development of the six cross sections we are presenting. No four lane cross sections, but can look at it if wanted.
- Once general decisions are made regarding which cross section applies to which area, revisions can be made to the cross section – like barrier need, location, and type. For example, the 2 ft barrier may not be needed or desired in non-detour



conditions. Definitely interested in different barrier types in non-detour conditions – do not like jersey barriers. Maintenance, recreational access, etc for barrier locations. Will work through these and other details after FIR plans are developed.

- Kevin - Clear Creek County partnering with GOCO. Discussion of GOCO requirements and scoring criteria. Team will confirm (i.e. does bike path have to be separated in order to get funding from GOCO?).
 - Team could incorporate into screening criteria. Kevin – important to consider so you don't preclude funding.
 - When applying for funds you have to know what the time frame is. For CCC to apply for grants in Phase II, it is important to know the timeframe for when CDOT is going to put improvements on the Frontage road. CDOT would have to come back in a year or two to complete Phase II. We have to be careful on when we apply for grants because there is a definitive time frame for money to be used. If CDOT knows what we are doing here and we know how much it is going to cost, then we can start planning for the future and looking at when.
- Janet called Darin - \$1.1 million a year for region 1 – CDOT transportation enhancement grants. \$300,000 is the average grant awarded. Deadline is December 1.
- Kevin O'Malley would like to see Phase I area become larger, with additional funding options to be able to do more. We have to think about other people outside this room so that whatever design we do can help us look for other funding. Ben reminded the PLT/TT that Phase I is all we expect to have funding to construct. At the outset we weren't even sure if we would be able to build the ultimate section in the Phase I area.
- Clear Creek County thinks 10 ft path should be considered for ease of maintenance. Current CCC typical section (like El Dorado Road) 11 ft lane, 4 ft bike lane, and 2 ft gravel shoulder. Pete – greenway does not want 4 ft shoulder as bike path. This works for El Dorado because of wide valley and opportunity to add a separated trail later.
- Rock boulder retaining wall is similar in cost to cast in place/MSE walls. Terracing can get expensive – terrace required after about 20 feet. Rock boulder wall provides the best product for value with a more context sensitive (i.e. natural) look.



- Various cross sections have been considered for each decision areas. A decision area may end up with a single or multiple cross sections.
- Western decision area:
 - Cross Section B from exit 241 to existing trailhead for separate trail behind substation. Trail on Cross Section B on south side of road. Cross Section A where there is an existing separated trail (behind substation and behind Idaho Springs Public works/Scott Lancaster Bridge, to old US 40). Short Cross Section B to connect the existing separated trail near aggregate plant.
 - Rick wants to see the plans and what it looks like with conceptual and existing conditions. Team will provide plans - available Nov. 18 for FIR review. Will discuss need for an “engineering” meeting between now and then.
 - Proposed greenway trail next to creek – long term vision. The proposed trail is a very long way off (20-25 years). Staying on the south side, you are accessing more existing trails. What is being proposed here makes sense. The proposed trail can make some existing trail throwaway. Doesn’t mean that you can’t have the proposed trail later. The Greenway ITF can help resolve some of this.
 - Cross Section B – barrier – can it be removable – will talk through specifics in Greenway ITF. If it can be removable, maintenance will be much easier. Current equipment cannot maintain 8 ft path. Probably could buy a piece of equipment that can maintain area.
 - Discussion of cross section A versus CCC cross section 11’, 4’, 2’.
 - Decision – continue with Cross Section A and B for this Decision Area, evaluate extending Cross Section F from gravel area to IS public works curve.
- Gravel/Dog house bridge area:
 - Option 1 - Double bridge option, cross section B with trail on the bridges
 - Option 2 - Single bridge option, cross section B with trail on the bridges
 - Option 3 – Improve gravel road, on existing alignment with Cross Section F. Doghouse bridge and existing trail will stay as is. We will pave existing and improve to meet county local access standards.



- Discussion of bridge Options 1 and 2:
 - Difference in cost with bridge and gravel road options – tbd.
 - The bridges will have to be wider due to geometry. Impacts to land and potential development at game check station.
 - Limited support from group for bridge options. Want to keep traffic away from the game check station.
 - Wider cross section and new bridges may be more desirable to people diverting from highway to frontage road if we go with Option 1 or 2. Improving gravel section to minimum width, keeping it narrow may maintain use as local road.
 - Still two really tight turns and that is undesirable for users, but make bridges too nice and more highway traffic may use.
 - We cannot put a pier in the water
- Don't use transverse rumble strips because bikers will still use the road. Bikers currently use the gravel part instead of using Lancaster trail. Needs better signing and striping to divert recreational users to the existing Scott Lancaster Trail.
- Lancaster bridge - -maybe move it during detour
- Clear Creek County likes the improving the gravel section -Option 3. Like the idea of an improved CR 314 rather than a Frontage Road. Would also like it build as part of Phase I.
- PLT support for Option 3 – improved gravel section.
- East of Gravel Road Area (Phase I)
 - Combination of B, D, and E
 - Formalizing pull-out helps people to know where to park and reduce informal parking along the road.
 - Will finalize cross sections, barriers, and river access in Greenway ITF.



- Rick asked if the team has looked at doing a combination of C and D in Phase I? You can't have vehicle loads on the cantilever, which you would have to if you accommodate bikes during detour. What is the priority of accommodating bikes during the detour? What is the load capacity of the cantilever? Can it accommodate equipment or large recreational loads? PLT members discussed and concluded that maintenance equipment is available to sweep and maintain the 8' bike/ped path. There was also a question about whether cantilever sections could accommodate vehicles. Response was that they can be built that way.
- General support for combination of cross sections shown.
- Eastern Decision Area
 - Cross Section B
 - Team will evaluate balancing cost and impact between impacts to existing retaining wall and private Bell property. Need to better understand ROW, access lines, and the wall (will be able to with survey).
 - None of the cross sections preclude the future proposed trail north of I-70.
 - Marjorie's house is already right up against the hill.
 - Bikes should probably be on the south side of the road, instead of the north. But would need to cross the frontage road and south side will cross residential access. Will look closer at this at the Greenway ITF.
- Screening Summary
 - Brief discussion of benefits, drawbacks, and conceptual costs of cross sections in each of the four decision areas. Each option presented will be fully evaluated as part of concept screening package.
 - Total project from interchange to interchange about \$20 million.
 - Phase I – East of Gravel Road approximately \$6 million with the ultimate section and boulder rock walls. CDOT wants to build as much as they can for the money.
 - Recreation grants will be small compared to the frontage road improvements cost.



7. Next Steps

- Should the design team move forward with these cross sections in mind or are there others that need to be consider? Aesthetics can be further refined as design progresses. PLT agreed with the recommended concepts and team should move forward.
- Add GOCO rules/criteria into screening, may be look at C combined with D in the East of Gravel Road Section.
- Next meeting – PLT invited to participate at the CDOT FIR (December 1) will have tighter cost estimate. Plans will be emailed out November 18.
- Team will post revised final work plan on the project website.
- Team will share revised screening criteria and share with PLT for comments.
- If you have any questions, please let Ben know.
- Look on the website for the information presented here as well as other information.

8. Action items:

- CF - Les's utility information and CDOT's pavement information provide to Clear Creek County (Rick Beck).
- BA - Rick Beck (CCC) requested review of bridge inspection after detour is done to confirm sufficiency. (Action item to Twin Tunnels team in 2013)
- JL – revise work plan desired outcomes
- JL – PLT PI Plan - clarify what FIR and FOR mean and add a couple of names to the PLT list.
- BA/JG - Combined calendar for twin tunnels, frontage road, and the greenway
- BA/JG - Survey and aerial data will be provided to the County's mapping department.
- MKF – distribute draft screening to PLT prior to FIR
- CF – follow up meeting with Clear Creek County road and bridge



- JG – follow up meeting with Marjorie Bell
- JL – set date for Greenway ITF
- JL – confirm GOCO requirements and scoring criteria (Jackie Miller from GOCO)