Clear Creek County Vision for the I-70 Mountain Corridor
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The Clear Creek County I-70 Mountain Corridor has long provided a means for travelers to easily access some of Colorado’s most scenic and recreational resources. Unfortunately, the cost of such accessibility and mobility can be at the expense of local Clear Creek County residents.

Wildlife habitats, historic sites and the scenic beauty of Clear Creek County have all been adversely affected by I-70 corridor development projects. Businesses and residents feel the effects as well, having to deal with traffic, noise/water/visual pollution and construction delays.

In an effort to identify opportunities that create positive impacts and avoid, minimize or mitigate negative impacts to Clear Creek County, while strengthening the communication between the County and the Colorado Department of Transportation, the Clear Creek County Commissioners and Staff, in association with outside consultants, have developed an Evaluation System that incorporates the values of the County and strategies for future development. These shared values include:

- Protecting small town communities and rural mountain settings
- Enhancing the vibrant local economy
- Preserving the natural, healthy environment
- Identifying and protecting local nationally recognized historic assets

The Evaluation System is comprised of an Assets & Opportunities Evaluation Matrix that identifies Measures of Success that are grouped into the values listed above, as well as four (4) regional Assets and Opportunities Maps that show current assets and opportunities as identified by residents, government officials and business owners in Clear Creek County.

The Evaluation System is endorsed and managed by the Clear Creek County Commissioners and will be utilized for all development projects along the Clear Creek County I-70 Mountain Corridor. The County, after soliciting support from the various Clear Creek communities, will create a standing Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Team will evaluate all projects so that a broad representation of the County is obtained and a collaborative outcome results. The Evaluation Team will be composed of a consistent group of communities and County staff, though the individuals participating in any given project’s review will vary.

The primary purpose of this Evaluation System is to review CDOT projects, but given the potential value of the system, it can be utilized for other projects in the I-70 Mountain Corridor as well.
2.1: Intent of the Visioning Effort

In the summer of 2013, Clear Creek County Commissioners Phil Buckland, Tim Mauck and Tom Hayden wanted to develop a Vision for the Clear Creek County I-70 Mountain Corridor that would ensure transportation projects in Clear Creek County were consistent with the goals, issues and values of the County. In order to achieve this goal, the Commissioners engaged a team of consultants to host a workshop consisting of County officials, residents, business owners and other interested parties to help build the Vision for the County.

Using the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process, invitations were extended to stakeholders in the county to be part of the Project Leadership Team (PLT). The PLT was comprised of County Commissioners, representatives from municipalities/County neighborhoods, Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the consultant team (Appendix B).

The first step of the Visioning Effort was to define the intent of the Visioning workshop, leading to the creation of the following goals:

- Discuss issues around and impacts from projects on I-70. Map locations where these issues and impacts occur.
- Document Clear Creek County Vision and Values around these issues.
- Develop preferred strategies to avoid and/or minimize I-70 impacts within Clear Creek County.
- Create evaluation tools for consistent reviews of all proposed projects for the I-70 Corridor based on Clear Creek County’s Vision and Values.
- Improve relationships among Clear Creek County, CDOT, other agencies and stakeholders through the consistent use of these tools on proposed projects.
- Provide current and future County Commissioners, County Staff and community leaders with an understanding of the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) Process and how participation facilitates creative strategies for implementing solutions within the County.

2.2: Overview of the Visioning Effort

After defining the intent, the PLT compiled and summarized a list of Master Plans (Clear Creek Greenway, Idaho Springs), Memorandums (SWEEP, ALIVE), Agreements (CSS) and other documents to send out to prospective participants of the workshop (Appendix C). Additionally, a list of contemplated CDOT and County projects/ideas/concepts for the I-70 Mountain Corridor were also sent (Appendix D). These documents presented prospective participants with enough background information to understand the idea behind the Visioning workshop and understand the magnitude of the effort about to be commenced. Participants were also asked to send photographic examples of community values and submit them for use before the workshop (Appendix E).

The Visioning Workshop was held on January 15-16, 2014 at the Easter Seals Rocky Mountain Village (Appendix F). Over 70 participants attended including County stakeholders, residents, agencies, businesses owners and other interested parties (Appendix G).
Day one of the workshop consisted of a review of Clear Creek County history and existing plans and agreements that should be taken into consideration on new projects along the I-70 Mountain Corridor. The attendees then divided into smaller groups to define their vision for Clear Creek County's future. Each group was led by a facilitator who recorded all the ideas that were discussed. At the conclusion of the first day, members of the consultant team incorporated the values and ideas that were collected and integrated them into an Assets & Opportunities Evaluation Matrix.

The second day of the workshop, participants were again divided into five small groups based upon their geographical location in Clear Creek County. Large scale maps of each area were used by members to identify geographical assets within the County that needed to be protected and opportunities the County had for improvements. These maps consisted of Eisenhower Tunnel to Silver Plume, Georgetown, Empire/Dumont/Lawson/Downieville, Idaho Springs, and East Clear Creek County. The groups were then asked to brainstorm strategies that create opportunities for improvement, which were recorded by the group facilitators.

The final task of the workshop gave groups the opportunity to test the Evaluation Matrix that was developed the prior day. Groups were randomly organized so that each group consisted of members from all areas of Clear Creek County. Each group was then handed a hypothetical CDOT project and asked to use the Matrix to evaluate the impacts of the project to the County and see if it met with the values that were put forth in the Matrix. The idea behind this exercise was not to see if the hypothetical projects were viable, but rather to measure the effectiveness of the Evaluation System itself.

At the conclusion of the workshop, members were all asked for their feedback on the Evaluation Matrix. This feedback was recorded and in the weeks that followed the consultant team incorporated changes to the Matrix and created 4 regional maps of Clear Creek County that organized all of the assets and opportunities as well as the strategies for each region.

The combined use of the Assets & Opportunities Evaluation Matrix and the regional Assets and Opportunities Maps will provide future Commissioners, staff and community leaders with an understanding of the current community goals, issues and values. Further, participating in this Evaluation System will facilitate creative solutions to issues within the County. Through the use of this collaboratively built system, relationships among Clear Creek County, CDOT, other agencies and stakeholders can improve by building understanding through consistent and value based responses to proposed projects.

2.3: Overview of the Process for Implementation

The Board of County Commissioners will acknowledge and endorse the Visioning and Evaluation System by taking formal action to adopt the effort and indicate to future Commissions and CDOT that the effort enjoyed both broad County and resident support.
SECTION III - DESIRED FUTURES

On the first day of the Visioning Workshop, attendees were split into regional groups and asked to describe their desired future for Clear Creek County. In order to describe the future, members were first asked to look back and point out things that history had taught the County.

The overwhelming response to historical lessons was the need for the County and its communities to be proactive in their recognition of assessing needs and working with the proper government officials and agencies to address these needs. Specifically, some items discussed included:

- Recognizing the increased use of the I-70 corridor and planning for increased utilization
- Developing better highway interchanges to mitigate increased usage and provide better access
- Separate local and regional trips as much as possible
- Understanding the impact that mining operations have both economically and environmentally on the community
- Using developable land efficiently

After discussing the past, members were then asked to describe their desired futures for the County. Many members mentioned projects that have already been completed, such as the creation of the Clear Creek Greenway Master Plan and the Idaho Springs Master Plan, as well as projects that are being considered or have been approved such as the Advanced Guideway System (AGS) or the Twin Tunnels Trailhead. The overall picture for the County was a desire to keep the historic small town sense of place while incorporating updated infrastructure and transportation technology. These desires were aimed at improving current residents' living conditions, increasing the desirability of local communities for future residents and businesses and providing a balance between local and regional transportation needs. Additionally, mass transportation options were identified as a major opportunity for Clear Creek County to reduce impacts to local residents.

Another desire expressed was the recreational development and preservation of Clear Creek along with enhancements of wildlife and natural environments. Residents envision a greenway that blends natural landscaping, wildlife crossings, bike paths, walking trails and raft put-ins that draw attention to Clear Creek communities but do not damage the natural beauty of the greenway or create hazards for the abundant wildlife the greenway supports.

Ideally, Clear Creek County residents would like to see a symbiotic relationship between the I-70 corridor users, County residents and communities to promote recreation, tourism, vibrant communities and efficient/safe travel. Finally, the aesthetics of I-70 was viewed as a very important quality of life issue for residents. The regional transportation facilities must harmonize with their surroundings and be a light touch on the land, subservient to the landscape. The transportation facilities must also respect urban, natural and historic settings.
4.1: Formal Action

To indicate their support of the Visioning effort and Evaluation System, the Clear Creek County Board of County Commissioners will accept the final report and evaluation system as final deliverables. Further, the Board will take formal action to memorialize their support of the system for the benefit of future Commissioners and County representatives. By taking this action, the Board demonstrates to the County’s constituents, CDOT and future Commissioners that this effort had broad support from the County as a whole.

Additionally, the Board will initiate discussions with CDOT to encourage their acknowledgment and use of the Vision and Evaluation System, both to shape projects as they are conceived and to incorporate results of evaluations on projects as they are reviewed.

4.2: Objective of the Evaluation System

The Evaluation System, comprised of the Assets & Opportunities Maps and the Assets & Opportunities Evaluation Matrix, is the tool developed for use by Clear Creek County to reach the goal of the County Commissioners to ensure that transportation projects within the Clear Creek County I-70 Mountain Corridor minimize impacts to the County assets, address the County’s issues and values and maximize the opportunities proposed.

Using this Evaluation System will provide future Commissioners, staff and community leaders with an understanding of the current community goals, issues and values. Further, participating in this Evaluation System, a Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process will facilitate creative solutions to issues within the County. Using the collaboratively built Evaluation System can improve relationships among Clear Creek County, CDOT, other agencies and stakeholders by building understanding through consistent and value based responses to proposed projects.

4.3: Utilization of the Evaluation System

The Evaluation System can be used on any project and at any phase in a project. It can also help in defining the parameters needed to develop a project.

The Evaluation System was built to highlight the issues that arise with projects on or associated with I-70. However, the assets, opportunities, issues and ideas represent Clear Creek County’s vision and values, and therefore are applicable throughout the County. Although the Evaluation System was developed with the specific intent of reviewing CDOT projects, it could also be used on other projects at the County’s discretion. The following are examples of uses for the Evaluation System envisioned by the County Commissioners:

- Evaluation of Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) projects, during any project development phase from project conception, to planning, to design and through construction.
- Evaluation of County projects intersecting or paralleling I-70.
- Evaluation of projects proposed by any federal or state agencies, such as the Forest Service.
- Evaluation of projects within a Town or neighborhood along the I-70 Corridor.

In all cases, the County can use the Evaluation System as it chooses to help ensure that the project is in line with its vision and goals.

Additionally, because CDOT is such a significant player in this effort, it is important for the County to engage them in the process. To ensure there is a common understanding between the two organizations and to document the understanding for future representatives, the Board will meet with representatives from CDOT to discuss the department’s involvement and support. The County will seek CDOT’s support in two ways. First, an acknowledgement of the County’s vision and its endeavor to incorporate that vision into projects as they are conceived. It will never be possible to incorporate 100% of the vision’s goals, however to ensure that the process is more collaborative and less contentious, CDOT will acknowledge that they understand the County’s vision and identify which issues will need to be discussed and resolved as part of new projects. Second, to make all attempts possible to include the County’s evaluation results and comments into projects, it would be appropriate for CDOT to memorialize their joint support of the Evaluation System.
At a minimum, all future projects will ideally be evaluated at the following project milestones:

- Initiation of project to provide an overview of the project concept and to identify as early as possible the County’s concerns and desired goals
- Field Inspection Review (a.k.a., FIR; 30% design level) to verify that the project concept, as developed, has addressed the County’s concerns and is working towards achieving the County’s goals
- Final Office Review (a.k.a., FOR; 90% design level) to verify that the construction plans have appropriately incorporated the County’s comments from previous reviews and all concerns and goals are addressed

4.4: Evaluation Teams and Responsibilities

When implementing the Evaluation System, it would be preferable to build a team comprised of individuals who would bring different perspectives to the table and who would collaborate to produce a more effective evaluation. Instead of having only the County or one individual community conducting an evaluation of a given project, a standing Evaluation Team will be established that would assess all projects presented to the County. The Evaluation Team would be composed of representatives from the County and all of the communities along the I-70 Mountain Corridor within the County (incorporated cities, unincorporated towns and even neighborhoods, as desired). This would provide broad representation of the County’s interests and produce better buy-in throughout the County. The County will work with the leadership of each community to identify who would best represent the community on the Evaluation Team. For example, the mayor, town administrator or HOA President might be contacted to participate or identify/appoint a representative on the Evaluation Team.

The Evaluation Team would be a multidisciplinary team, a cross section of stakeholders and experts relevant to the project goals and issues. These may include, but are not limited to, stakeholders such as business owners, residents, local community planners, engineers, municipal maintenance personnel, historians, emergency providers and environmental specialists. During the development of the Team, consider all of the cities and towns within the project limits, as well as non-governmental organizations relevant to the project.

The Evaluation Team assembled for each project would be led by the community in which the project is located, and specifically the community’s representative to the CDOT Project Leadership Team (PLT).

In the typical case of a CDOT project, the County or a community will be asked to participate on a PLT for the project. During the process of identifying the PLT representative, the County and community will agree on the applicability of the system and logistics mentioned above.

The PLT representative will be responsible for convening the Evaluation Team and conducting evaluations. Based on the project’s issues and complexity, the Team could discuss the need to engage a third-party facilitator for the evaluation.

After the Evaluation Team assesses the project, a summary report will be prepared by the PLT representative. This summary and the Evaluation Matrix will be provided to Clear Creek County and CDOT as part of the formal comments submitted for the milestone review. At each subsequent review of the project, the Evaluation Team will also check to determine whether previous evaluation comments had been appropriately addressed.

4.5: Evaluation System Administration

The County will devote a page on their Web site to the Visioning effort and Evaluation System. The site will present the purpose and process of the Visioning and contain all information supporting use of the Evaluation System, such as maps, issues and strategies, guidance for implementation of the system and the Evaluation Matrix itself. The County will be responsible for administering and updating the system and documents.

Continuous improvement of the Evaluation System is important. In order to benefit from experience gained with each application of the evaluation, the Evaluation Team should conduct a lessons-learned assessment after each evaluation. The County will update the Evaluation System appropriately and repost the updated documents on the Web site.
### SECTION V - USER INSTRUCTIONS

5.1: User Instructions

This system provides a structured way for stakeholders to discover and discuss the issues surrounding a project. The Evaluation System does not define the answer; it leads to a discussion that highlights the impacts and opportunities presented by a project, thus organizing the identification of assets to avoid, suggestions for potential mitigation for impacts, and proposals of alternative designs that might reduce or eliminate impacts. Using the Evaluation System goes further than just recommendations; it provides the underlying thinking and values for these suggestions.

Step One: Evaluation Team meets to understand the project and reviews the goals for the project.

Step Two: Evaluation Team meets and reviews the following resources:

- CSS I-70 Mountain Corridor Asset and Opportunities Map
- *CSS I-70 Mountain Corridor Opportunities and Ideas list*
- *CSS I-70 Mountain Corridor Public Comment Map*
- *CSS I-70 Mountain Corridor Visual Assessment Maps*
- *CSS I-70 Mountain Corridor I-70 Functional Map*
- Greenway Master Plan
- *ALIVE; SWEEP; Section 106 PA*
- *Other Master Plans*

Step Three: Evaluation Team completes the Asset and Opportunities Evaluation Matrix

For best results, the use of a trained facilitator is suggested, particularly if the project is controversial.

For ongoing records and retrieval of evaluations, the Evaluation Team should complete the date, project name and why the County is responding with an evaluation at this time, as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: Provide date when all reviews are completed and recommendations were forwarded to sponsors.</th>
<th>Clear Creek County Asset and Opportunities Evaluation for Project CDOT # CCC # (if applicable) Name of Project</th>
<th>Why is this Review being completed? Define who requested the review and the phase of the project (i.e. preliminary design)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the evaluation, complete each column as suggested below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Measure of Success</strong></td>
<td>+/- Opportunity/Impact</td>
<td>What is the opportunity? What is the concern/issue? What is the severity of the impact?</td>
<td>How should this be addressed?</td>
<td>Are there specific ideas and/or recommendations you want considered? What is the timing and implementation?</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This information is provided as a part of the Evaluation Matrix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer the question for each issue and Measure of Success – “Is this a positive or negative impact on this project?” It may be noted as NA.</td>
<td>List the opportunities, by issues, within the project area as described on the Asset and Opportunities Map or discussed by the Team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add other information that could help the agency or designer with a deeper understanding of the goals, values and ideas presented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List the concerns, by issue, within the project area as described on the Asset and Opportunities Map or discussed by the Team.</td>
<td>For each issue, describe the value and/or goal of the County that is being impacted by the project and what the team sees as the best way to address the impact (i.e. Analyze during environmental documentation; Address in the design phase of the project; Coordinate with business owners)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For each opportunity identified, provide explanation on how to exploit this opportunity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Process for Amending the Evaluation System

The overarching value of sustainability demands that the Evaluation System have balance -- today and for future generations. This Amendment Process allows for the best and newest ideas, consistent with the County's vision and goals, to be incorporated over time. To ensure flexibility to address and/or incorporate innovations, new techniques, advanced technologies and emerging trends, the Evaluation System has been designed for revision and updating through the following Amendment Process.

This Amendment Process respects the collaborative and open approach used to develop the Evaluation System. Follow the steps provided below to amend the Evaluation System and E-mail amendment requests to Clear Creek County.

1. Define the Desired Changes
   - Establish a multidisciplinary group to complete the Amendment Process
   - Identify elements for review and potential amendment or revision

2. Endorse the Process
   - Notify the Board of County Commissioners of the desire to amend the Evaluation System

3. Establish Criteria and Develop Suggested Changes
   - Determine why these amendments or revisions are needed and the benefits amending the system will provide
   - Identify additional information needs
   - Capture the proposed revision with the benefits
   - Consider Lessons Learned as support for your suggested changes

4. Evaluate and Document Changes
   - Present to and discuss with the Board of County Commissioners the proposed revision
   - Document changes by changing the Map, the Matrix, and/or the instructions
## SECTION VI - ASSETS & OPPORTUNITIES EVALUATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue Description</td>
<td>Live here / work here</td>
<td>Measure of Success</td>
<td>+/- Opportunity/ Impact</td>
<td>What is the opportunity?</td>
<td>What is the concern/issue?</td>
<td>What is the severity of the impact?</td>
<td>How should this be addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMALL TOWN COMMUNITY &amp; RURAL MOUNTAIN SETTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>Balances 2nd home ownership and primary residences</td>
<td>Improves diversity of quality employment</td>
<td>• Provides education options</td>
<td>• Provides improved access to residential/ commercial and medical facilities</td>
<td>• Improves connectivity between and within communities</td>
<td>• Balances regional and local needs</td>
<td>• Maintains small community feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility</strong></td>
<td>Efficiently uses existing ROW</td>
<td>Includes Multi-modal</td>
<td>• Employs new technology</td>
<td>• Improves local mobility</td>
<td>• Considers travel demand management and transportation system management</td>
<td>• Provides emergency access</td>
<td>• Enhances walkability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right of Way</strong></td>
<td>Maximizes the opportunity for development (Hotel, Medical facilities, Retail, etc)</td>
<td>Efficiently uses existing ROW</td>
<td>• Reduces ROW</td>
<td>• Maximizes the opportunity for development (Hotel, Medical facilities, Retail, etc)</td>
<td>• Creates additional developable parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Response</strong></td>
<td>Improves I-70 EMS response time</td>
<td>Improves diversity of quality employment</td>
<td>• Provides reliable and affordable transports to nearest hospital</td>
<td>• Improves EMS access to communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Description</td>
<td>Measure of Success</td>
<td>+/- Opportunity/ Impact</td>
<td>What is the opportunity? What is the concern/issue?</td>
<td>What is the severity of the impact?</td>
<td>How should this be addressed?</td>
<td>Are there specific ideas and/or recommendations you want considered? What is the timing and implementation?</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Enhances the County as a destination</td>
<td>Provides quality employment</td>
<td>Meet County/Cities/Neighborhood Plans</td>
<td>Opportunity for infrastructure for projects – housing, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Supports existing or enhancements to recreation areas</td>
<td>Attracts recreational users</td>
<td>Provides appropriate access to recreation facilities.</td>
<td>Improves connectivity among facilities</td>
<td>Improves signage for tourist attractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Consider including future infrastructure needs</td>
<td>Improvement opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>Mitigates mine waste</td>
<td>Is the project within the Mineral Belt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Decrease existing noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>Supports the ALIVE MOU</td>
<td>Enhances viewing opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Maintains or improves current air quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>Supports the SWEEP MOU</td>
<td>Supports Clear Creek Sediment Control Action Plan (SCAP)</td>
<td>Supports recreation</td>
<td>Provides restoration opportunities</td>
<td>Opportunity for natural flood plain restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>Supports the Greenway Master Plan</td>
<td>Preserves the areas needed for a fully separated trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>The project does not present undue burdens on the county/cities or neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Description</td>
<td>Measure of Success</td>
<td>+/- Opportunity/Impact</td>
<td>What is the opportunity?</td>
<td>What is the concern/issue?</td>
<td>What is the severity of the impact?</td>
<td>How should this be addressed?</td>
<td>Are there specific ideas and/or recommendations you want considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL HISTORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Asset Preservation</td>
<td>• Respects identified historic sites and districts</td>
<td>• Reduces negative impacts</td>
<td>• Provides restoration opportunities</td>
<td>• Increases heritage tourism opportunities</td>
<td>• Provides opportunities for constructive reuse</td>
<td>• Abides by the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT CONSULTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS)</td>
<td>• Follows established CSS Guidance</td>
<td>• Establishes a PLT</td>
<td>• Uses CSS for both process and design</td>
<td>• Includes representatives from communities (the experts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td>• Protects or improves existing views from the interstate</td>
<td>• Protects or improves existing views from the community</td>
<td>• Assess visual impacts for enhancement opportunities</td>
<td>• Follows the Aesthetic Guidelines</td>
<td>• Reduces visual clutter</td>
<td>• Protects or improves views from major recreation areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signing</strong></td>
<td>• Relieve visual clutter</td>
<td>• Respects visual context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>• Meets I-70 Mountain Corridor Design Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td>• Maintains flow of traffic</td>
<td>• Monitors economic impact to communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>• Defines level of maintenance</td>
<td>• Defines who is responsible</td>
<td>• Identifies costs</td>
<td>• Provides appropriate access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships</strong></td>
<td>• Develops partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introductions and History of the project

2. Project Process to be followed

3. Project Leadership Team Roles and Responsibilities

4. Your vision for what this plan can accomplish

5. Review Stakeholder list
1. Review *Intent of the Work* and Process for the project

2. Discuss Workshop outcomes and agenda

3. Discuss Workshop background materials

4. Discuss Workshop Attendees and invitations

The intent of the Clear Creek County Vision for the I-70 Mountain Corridor is to:

- Discuss issues around and impacts from projects on I-70. Map locations where these issues and impacts occur.
- Document Clear Creek County Vision and Values around these issues.
- Develop preferred strategies to avoid and minimize I-70 impacts within Clear Creek County.
- Create evaluation tools for consistent reviews of all proposed projects for the I-70 Corridor based on Clear Creek County’s Vision and Values.
- Improve relationships among Clear Creek County, CDOT, other agencies, and stakeholders through the consistent use of these tools on proposed projects.
- Provide current and future County Commissioners, County Staff, and community leaders with an understanding of the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) Process and how participation facilitates creative strategies for implementing solutions within the county.

Agenda for the Workshop

January 15, 2014 – 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

1. Introductions and plan for the workshop
2. Project Outcomes, Products, and Tools
3. County History focused on I-70 with recent activities highlighted
4. Review existing plans and agreements for I-70
5. Discuss trends and criteria-
   What has the County’s history taught us?
   What should the future hold?
   What do you want CDOT to consider as projects are planned on I-70?
   Describe the life style that will exist when the I-70 improvements are completed.

January 16, 2014 – 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

1. Recap yesterday and review today’s agenda
2. Discuss the County’s assets and opportunities along I-70
3. Review County Measures of Success based on yesterday’s trend discussion
4. Develop the Evaluation Tool through testing corridor projects

Final Report Outline

1. Introduction
2. Map of Clear Creek County assets and opportunities along I-70
3. Impacts I-70 can have on these assets and opportunities
4. Considerations for designs that create positive impacts and avoid minimize and mitigate negative impacts
5. Evaluation Criteria for proposed projects

Appendix
Process and participants in the creation of this document
1. Discuss Workshop Attendees and follow up invitations
   a. Dec. 1st – invitation is out
   b. Dec. 16th – introduction to the project, CCC project intent, why your group was included; summaries; project list; photo idea
   c. Jan. 1st week – reminder and agenda

2. Describe the Asset and Opportunities Evaluation System
   a. Map
   b. Evaluation Template (see back of agenda)

3. Review Workshop agenda and logistics
   a. Presenters
   b. Facilitators
   c. Materials

4. Review Workshop background materials
   a. Summaries
   b. Maps
   c. Photos

   Handouts
   Stakeholder/Invitee list and current RSVP
   Summaries
   Project/Concepts/Idea List
   Workshop agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Is this of concern on this project?</th>
<th>How should this be addressed on this project</th>
<th>Are there specific ideas and/or recommendations you want considered on this project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Review the Asset and Opportunities Map</td>
<td>NEPA, formal agreement, design, construction</td>
<td>Review the Opportunities and Idea List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Clutter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Review Workshop agenda and speakers

2. Discuss Workshop background materials

3. Discuss Workshop Attendees and logistics

4. Discuss the 6 Step Process and Life Cycle Process

1. Debrief on the Workshop
   a. What went well?
   b. What would you change?
   c. Were there unexpected benefits/challenges?

2. Discuss the Evaluation System (Map and Matrix)
   a. Additions
   b. Deletions
   c. Changes for other uses (Pre-planning; planning; reviewing design)
   d. Organization of Issues

3. Discuss Process
   a. For the use of the Evaluation System
   b. Formal adoption
   c. Agreement with CDOT

4. Final Report
   a. Add recommended next steps
   b. Timing

5. County Commission Meeting – February 4th and 18th
   a. Presentation
      i. Background and Intent of the project
      ii. Workshop layout and goals
      iii. Input gathered
   b. Timing on report
   c. Public invitation for the 4th or 18th?

6. Next PLT Meeting – none scheduled
## APPENDIX B - PROJECT LEADERSHIP TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company/Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phil Buckland</td>
<td>Clear Creek County Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Condon</td>
<td>Idaho Springs Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hale</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Hearn</td>
<td>Floyd Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hillman</td>
<td>Idaho Springs Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Coch</td>
<td>Town of Empire Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Lyssy</td>
<td>Silver Plume Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Neely</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larrice Sell</td>
<td>Downieville, Lawson, Dumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ann Sorensen</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Brown</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Singer</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta LaRiviere</td>
<td>CH2M Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo Vobejda</td>
<td>CH2M Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Yearsley</td>
<td>CH2M Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juile Gamec</td>
<td>THK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Navarro</td>
<td>THK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Shanks</td>
<td>THK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C - SUMMARIES OF RELATED DOCUMENTS

What is the Collaborative Effort team?

The Colorado Department of Transportation commenced a Collaborative Effort team to address the stakeholders’ desire to be involved in the identification of the Preferred Alternative. An interview process involving more than 50 stakeholders throughout the Corridor was conducted by the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution to identify stakeholder issues and make recommendations regarding a process for developing consensus on a Preferred Alternative. Stakeholders voiced a range of procedural interests, concerns, and suggestions, ranging from a lack of trust and confidence in agency decision making to acknowledgement that not all stakeholder groups have identical interests to voicing a desire for alternatives to be able to adapt better to future trends and conditions.

Based on interview results, CDOT formed a 27-member Collaborative Effort team that included one representative from each of the following entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blue River Group, Sierra Club</th>
<th>Federal Highway Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Idaho Springs</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Garfield County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Association of Transit Agencies</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain Rail Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Dept. of Transportation Region 1</td>
<td>Summit Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Dept. of Transportation Region 3</td>
<td>Summit Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Environmental Coalition</td>
<td>Town of Frisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Motor Carriers Association</td>
<td>Town of Georgetown, Georgetown Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Rail Passenger Association</td>
<td>Town of Vail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Ski Country USA</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>United States Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Vail Resorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Collaborative Effort team’s objective was to reach consensus for Corridor transportation solutions that address stakeholder issues, consistent with the project purpose and need statement. The lead agencies participated in the development of the Consensus Recommendation for the Corridor. During the consensus building process, they agreed to adopt the Consensus Recommendation as the Preferred Alternative if all of the stakeholders could reach consensus. The Collaborative Effort team has convened at key project milestones during completion of this PEIS, and will continue to meet through the implementation of the Preferred Alternative.

How was the Preferred Alternative (Consensus Recommendation) developed?

In June 2008, the Collaborative Effort team identified a “Consensus Recommendation” that included a multimodal solution, an incremental and adaptive approach to transportation improvements, and a commitment to continued stakeholder involvement. The lead agencies identified the Preferred Alternative for the I-70 Mountain Corridor based on the Consensus Recommendation (see Appendix C, Consensus Recommendation of the FPEIS) developed by the Collaborative Effort team.

The Collaborative Effort process and the Consensus Recommendation adhered to the purpose and need, provided for the long-range transportation needs beyond 2035 by establishing a vision for 2050, and agreed that the Preferred Alternative had to meet a 2050 purpose and need. The Consensus Recommendation identifies multimodal solution of transit and highway improvements based on proven needs to enhance the Corridor, its environment, and its communities. The criteria below informed the Collaborative Effort’s recommendation and will serve as criteria of effectiveness moving forward:
The solution should improve safety and mobility for all users.
The solution should be responsive and adaptive to broader global trends that will affect the way we make travel decisions in the future.
The solution will meet the purpose and need and all environmental and legal requirements.
The solution should preserve, restore, and enhance community and cultural resources.
The solution should preserve and restore or enhance ecosystem functions.
The solution should be economically viable over the long term.

The Consensus Recommendation is fully evaluated and referred to in this document as the Preferred Alternative.

**What is the Preferred Alternative?**


The Preferred Alternative is a multimodal solution and includes three main components identified by the Collaborative Effort team: non-infrastructure components, an Advanced Guideway System, and highway improvements. The Preferred Alternative is presented as a range of improvement options from a Minimum Program of Improvements to a Maximum Program of Improvements. The Minimum Program of Improvements is detailed below.

**Non-infrastructure Related Components –** These are strategies that can begin in advance of major infrastructure improvements to address some of the immediate issues in the Corridor.

**Advanced Guideway System** – The Advanced Guideway System is a central part of the Preferred Alternative and includes the commitment by the lead agencies to the evaluation and implementation of an Advanced Guideway System within the Corridor, including a vision for 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.

**Highway Improvements** – Additional highway improvements are needed to address current Corridor conditions and future demands. Those improvements will be planned taking into consideration all elements of the Preferred Alternative and local land use planning. Improvements are listed in two categories: specific highway improvements and other highway projects. The “specific highway improvements” are called out specifically as the triggers for consideration of the future highway capacity improvements included in the Maximum Program of Improvements.

Specific highway improvements include six-lane highway from Floyd Hill through the Twin Tunnels, including a bike trail and frontage roads from Idaho Springs to Hidden Valley and Hidden Valley to US 6; Empire Junction (US 40 and the I-70 highway) interchange improvements; eastbound auxiliary lane from Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels to Herman Gulch; and westbound auxiliary lane from Bakerville to Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels.

Other highway projects include truck operation improvements, curve safety improvements west of Wolcott, safety improvements and six-lane highway capacity through Dowd Canyon, interchange improvements at 26 locations along the Corridor, and auxiliary lanes in four additional locations along the Corridor.

In developing the Preferred Alternative, the Collaborative Effort team recognized that the Minimum Program of Improvements may not provide adequate highway capacity to meet long-term transportation needs. Based on information available today, the Minimum Program of Improvements alone does not meet the 2050 purpose and need for the Corridor, and additional highway capacity is needed. 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 of Improvements is comprised of all of the components of the Minimum Program of Improvements 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. Based on information available today and for the purposes of NEPA disclosure, all of the improvements identified in the Maximum Program of Improvements are assumed to be needed to meet the 2050 purpose and need.

The Preferred Alternative figure below illustrates the transportation improvements associated with the Preferred Alternative. The base map shows the improvements included in the Minimum Program of Improvements, while the callout box details the improvements that would be added to the base improvements of the Minimum Program to comprise the Maximum Program.
What is the I-70 Mountain Corridor Context Sensitive Solutions Process?

(http://www.i70mtncorridorcss.com)

The Federal Highway Administration defines Context Sensitive Solutions as:

Context Sensitive Solutions is a collaborative, interdisciplinary approach that involves all stakeholders to develop a transportation facility that fits its physical setting and preserves scenic, aesthetic, historic, and environmental resources, while maintaining safety and mobility. CSS (Context Sensitive Solutions) is an approach that considers the total context within which a transportation improvement project will exist. CSS principles include the employment of early, continuous and meaningful involvement of the public and all stakeholders throughout the project development process.

The application of CSS principles within the transportation planning process assists regions and communities reach their transportation goals by encouraging the consideration of land use, transportation, and infrastructure needs in an integrated manner. When transportation planning reflects community input and takes into consideration the impacts on both natural and human environments, it also promotes partnerships that lead to “balanced” decision-making. This is a core principle of CSS. In 2007, CDOT formed an I-70 Mountain Corridor Context Sensitive Solutions team of 150 public and agency stakeholders to develop Context Sensitive Solutions Guidance for the Corridor. The I-70 Mountain Corridor Context Sensitive Solutions process is built on a commitment to collaborative decision making. The process includes the following six steps:

Step 1 – Define Desired Outcomes and Actions: Using the I-70 Mountain Corridor Context Sensitive Solutions Guidance and other relevant materials, this step establishes the project goals and actions. It also defines the terms to be used and decisions to be made.

Step 2 – Endorse the Process: This step establishes participants, roles, and responsibilities for each team. The process is endorsed by discussing, possibly modifying, and then finalizing with all teams the desired outcomes and actions to be taken.

Step 3 – Establish Criteria: This step establishes criteria, which provide the basis for making decisions consistent with the desired outcomes and project goals. The criteria measure support for the Core Values for the I-70 Mountain Corridor.

Step 4 – Develop Alternatives or Options: The project staff works with the Project Leadership Team, stakeholders, and the public to identify alternatives or options relevant to the desired outcomes, project-specific vision, and goals.

Step 5 – Evaluate, Select, and Refine Alternative or Option: The process of analyzing and evaluating alternatives applies the criteria to the alternatives or options in a way that facilitates decision making. This may be a one-step or multi-step process depending on the complexity of the alternatives and the decision.

Step 6 – Finalize Documentation and Evaluate Process: Documentation should be continuous throughout the process. Final documentation will include each of the previous steps, final recommendations, and the process evaluation.
A. What is the I-70 CSS Design Criteria?

(http://www.coloradodot.info/projects/contextsensitivesolutions/design/design-criteria.html)

The design criteria provides overarching principles for design of the entire I-70 Mountain Corridor, and are supported by the Corridor Aesthetic Guidance. The principles on which the design criteria are based are: a) establishing a corridor design character, b) developing an integrated and complete design, c) considering community-oriented land uses, d) using the PEIS as a base, and e) incorporating Aesthetic Guidance to produce an overall benefit to the Corridor.

The Design Criteria are considered mandatory for any project on the I-70 Mountain Corridor. Justification for any criteria that would not be met as determined during design must be presented, discussed, and agreed upon by the PLT. Justification and approval of exceptions are based on nine pre-established parameters.

Seven required Engineering Design Criteria have been developed to address the unique characteristics of the I-70 Mountain Corridor. These criteria are intended to influence the alignment of the transportation facilities and are an essential component of engineering design.

The Engineering Design Criteria have been developed and adopted by the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) because they represent an approach that enhances safety, mobility, and sustainability while reducing maintenance through design and engineering.

Design Criteria Categories
The following Design Criteria categories direct the development of both I-70 and the Advanced Guideway Systems (AGS)*:
- Design speed
- Alignment
- Slope cut and fill
- Disturbance
- Rock cut
- Bridge structures
- Sound attenuation

B. What is the I-70 CSS Aesthetic Guidance?

(http://www.coloradodot.info/projects/contextsensitivesolutions/design/i-70-mountain-corridor-aesthetics-guidance)

The I-70 Mountain Corridor Aesthetic Guidance provides an aesthetic vision for the entire corridor that will guide the design of future projects and improvements. The aesthetic vision describes how the overall corridor will look and describes the aesthetic approach to unique places in the corridor.

The I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS Team established the overall Corridor Aesthetic Principles and Regional Functional Context. Additionally, the Colorado Department of Transportation convened Aesthetic Working Groups to assist the corridor and consultant teams in preparing the Aesthetic Guidance. The working groups collaboratively developed descriptions for four geographic Design Segments, as well as Areas of Special Attention and aesthetic themes within each segment, that collectively include the entire I-70 Mountain Corridor. The four Design Segments include:

- Front Range Foothills
- Mountain Mineral Belt
- Crest of the Rockies
- Western Slope Canyons and Valleys

The Aesthetic Guidance creates the aesthetic context for the corridor. It is grouped together by Design Segments and includes design elements appropriate to each segment. Clear Creek County falls within the Mountain Mineral Belt.

What is the SWEEP Memorandum of Understanding?

The Stream and Wetland Ecological Enhancement Program (SWEEP) committee drafted a Memorandum of Understanding, which focuses on enhancing stream and wetland ecology in the Corridor, in 2008. The agreement is intended to establish common ground among agencies and organizations with interests in stream and wetland ecology in the Corridor to create mitigation strategies and systems and define collaboration among the interested parties. The Memorandum of Understanding was signed on January 4, 2011.

What is the ALIVE Memorandum of Understanding?

A Landscape Level of Integrated Valued Ecosystems (ALIVE) committee included a multi-agency committee of wildlife professionals. In April 2008, CDOT, FHWA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Colorado Division of Wildlife signed a Memorandum of Understanding documenting their commitment to identify mitigation and conservation measures during future (Tier 2) processes to reduce animal-vehicle collisions and increase habitat connectivity for terrestrial and aquatic species. This landscape-based ecosystem approach for consideration of wildlife needs and conservation identifies measures to improve existing aquatic and terrestrial ecosystem connectivity across the I-70 Mountain Corridor between Denver and Glenwood Springs.

What is the I-70 Mountain Corridor Section 106 Programmatic Agreement?

In 2008, the lead agencies and other signatories executed a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement among the United States Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer regarding implementation of the Interstate 70 Mountain Corridor Project, September 2008, in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. In this agreement, developed over several years, the lead agencies committed to initiate, before Tier 2 undertakings, development of design guidelines and historic context(s) for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. The guidelines are consistent with the principles of Context Sensitive Solutions and CDOT’s Policy Memo 26, Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) Vision for CDOT, which was issued in October 2005 to explain CDOT’s commitment and vision for Context Sensitive Solutions in Colorado. The intent of the engineering design criteria, aesthetic guidelines, and the historic context is to guide future undertakings on the Corridor.

What is the I-70 Clear Creek Corridor Sediment Control Action Plan (SCAP)?

The formation of the Sediment Control Action Plan (SCAP) for the reach of Interstate 70 (I-70) tributary to Clear Creek is a collaborative partnership between the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the local mountain communities and entities in the Clear Creek watershed. The SCAP document was developed as a tool for CDOT and other agencies to better manage roadway traction sand and other highway-related sediment sources that can adversely impact the Clear Creek waterway. The SCAP study area is entirely within Clear Creek County and covers a 33-mile segment of I-70 from the east portal of the Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnel (MP 215) to the eastern side of Floyd Hill at Beaver Brook (MP 248). Georgetown Lake (MP 229) is a significant water body within this reach and divides the study area between upper and lower Clear Creek. The SCAP document, consisting of a Technical Report and Mapbook, provides the justification, technical basis and approach for controlling sedimentation within the I-70 roadway corridor along Clear Creek. This report describes existing conditions, environmental considerations and requirements, BMP design tools, CDOT’s maintenance program, an estimate of costs, and an implementation approach plan. The document develops a plan that can be expanded and revised in the future to help manage the sediment loading to Clear Creek. The SWEEP Memorandum of Understanding Clear Creek SCAP Colorado Department of Transportation September 2013 2 (MOU), dated January 4, 2011, and this SCAP have set the foundation for sediment control in the Clear Creek I-70 corridor.

What is the Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030?

The Clear Creek County Master Plan 2030 is a comprehensive plan that sets the stage for the future development and management of the county's natural, cultural, and community resources. The plan is designed to provide a framework for decision-making and to ensure that future development is consistent with the county's vision and values.
The role of the Clear Creek County Master Plan is to serve as a policy document for development decisions in the unincorporated area of the County. The Master Plan can be considered as the foundation that establishes guiding principles for all development in the County. Potential Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) with other agencies and municipalities will be identified in the Master Plan.

**Purpose of the Plan**

The Clear Creek Master Plan has several purposes:

- To communicate the land use policy of Clear Creek County to citizens, landowners, development interests and other governmental jurisdictions.
- To provide a policy basis for updating the Zoning, Subdivision Regulations and other land use regulations and procedures and to evaluate whether they are consistent with the community’s vision for the future.
- To provide a basis for intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) with the municipalities of Clear Creek County, adjacent jurisdictions and numerous public and semi-public agencies that provide services to Clear Creek County residents.
- To encourage County departments, other agencies and private development interests to design and develop projects which are compatible with the natural resources and capabilities of the land and the capabilities of public services and facilities.
- To provide a basis for establishing priorities and developing funding mechanisms for public capital improvements in Clear Creek County.

**Legal Authority**

Pursuant to state statute (C.R.S. 30-28-101 et. seq.), it is the duty of the County Planning Commission to make and adopt a Master Plan for the unincorporated County. While the statutes clearly recognize the essential role of the Master Plan, it is considered advisory and not legally binding upon the land use decisions of the County.

**What is the Clear Creek Greenway Plan?**

[http://www.co.clear-creek.co.us/DocumentCenter/Home/View/928](http://www.co.clear-creek.co.us/DocumentCenter/Home/View/928)

The development of the Clear Creek Greenway was first identified in the adopted 1990 Clear Creek County Inter-county Non-Motorized Corridor Master Plan. The Greenway then became the focal point of the 2003 Open Space Plan and a major development recommendation of the 2030 Clear Creek County Master Plan. The Greenway, as envisioned in these plans, will serve as the backbone of Clear Creek County. It links the communities together with a string of open spaces, parks, recreational facilities and commercial recreational facilities along the creek. The Greenway will be the framework of the open space program, with connections to other open spaces such as the national forest, parks, recreation facilities and tourist attractions. It would further the goal of completing a trail system extending from the Continental Divide to the Platte River.

The Plan represents the Trail Plan and River Access Opportunities recently adopted by the Clear Creek County Open Space Commission that support the development of the Clear Creek Greenway. The concept consists of a main arterial trail and key open space areas to create an interconnecting corridor of parks, trail connections, recreational activities and related amenities. The Greenway will incorporate, enhance and create many types of active and passive recreational opportunities along Clear Creek. Those opportunities include kayaking, rafting, hiking, walking, biking, picnicking, camping and fishing. It will also link existing attractions along Clear Creek, including commercial rafting, historic sites, big horn sheep viewing and the Georgetown Loop railroad. Other possible attractions include a sculpture park, a demonstration garden, accessible fishing areas and interpretive displays highlighting the County’s mining heritage and natural environment.

Developing the Greenway as a major recreational corridor will not only provide recreation opportunities and open space, but also enhance economic development opportunities within the County and its municipalities. Joint ventures with commercial recreation providers will be possible. Related commercial uses would be encouraged to locate near the creek. The Greenway will link to commercial tourist attractions in the towns and encourage visitors to shop, rent bikes, purchase fishing equipment and dine. Finally, the Greenway will be a draw for businesses looking to locate in an area that provides such a quality of life resource to their employees. Because of its easy access and visibility, the Clear Creek Greenway has the potential to become a wonderful community amenity and a significant tourist destination. Through significant assistance from GOCO, the National Park Service, the Colorado Department of Transportation, local municipalities and organizations, the Clear Creek County Open Space developed this plan to foster growth and attract funding.
Greenway Objectives Identified in the 2030 Clear Creek County Master Plan

• Gain outside funding and create and implement a master plan for the Clear Creek Greenway in 2004.
• Immediately request transfer of management of appropriate County-owned parcels along the Greenway to the OSC.
• Begin to acquire appropriate privately owned parcels and easements along the Greenway.
• Work with the city of Idaho Springs to create a “Creekwalk” through town.
• Rehabilitate the main channel of Clear Creek and prohibit further filling of the creek. Public lands should be a top priority for rehabilitation.
• Link the Greenway with the planned trail around Georgetown Lake and the planned trail along the creek.
• Connect Silver Plume’s open space, historic town and the 730 Mine Trail with the Greenway.
• Link Idaho Springs’ new open space to the north of town to the Greenway.

Additional Plans Available For Review

A. Georgetown Comprehensive Plan

(http://www.town.georgetown.co.us/GeorgetownComprehensivePlan/zoom/default.htm)
(http://www.town.georgetown.co.us/GeorgetownComprehensivePlan/zoom/partII.htm)

B. Idaho Springs Comprehensive Plan

(http://www.idahospringsco.com/pdf/ISPCompPlan071408.pdf)

C. Floyd Hill Gateway Sub-Regional Master Plan

(http://www.co.clear-creek.co.us/DocumentCenter/Home/View/993)

D. D-L-D Stakeholder Document*

E. Bakerville Neighborhood Land Use Plan (Not Adopted)*

F. Silver Heritage Area Internal Transit Plan (Not Adopted)*

*Documents Available Through JoAnn Sorensen at Clear Creek County
APPENDIX D - CONTEMPLATED CDOT AND COUNTY PROJECTS

Contemplated CDOT and County Projects/Ideas/Concepts for the I-70 Mountain Corridor

Clear Creek County Transportation Visioning

December 11, 2013

The following projects, and concepts which form the basis for potential projects, are examples of ideas that have been envisioned by the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), Clear Creek County, and others, for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. They have been grouped by their level of maturity and stage of implementation. While some projects have the appropriate environmental clearance and agreements are in place, others are simply concepts and may not have received either the necessary environmental clearance or have the political support to move forward at this time. The projects without clearance or agreements in place are provided simply to provide an understanding of the ideas being contemplated on the corridor as the County’s evaluation system is being developed and vetted.

Agreements in place and/or projects being implemented:

- I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD)
- Stream and Wetland Ecological Enhancement Program (SWEEP)
- A Landscape Level Inventory of Valued Ecosystem Components (ALIVE)
- Section 106 Programmatic Agreement
- Peak Period Shoulder Lanes
- Eastbound Twin Tunnels Widening/Trailhead/Stream Enhancements
- US 6 chain stations
- Eastbound auxiliary lanes from the Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnel (EJMT) to Herman Gulch
- Wetland Mitigation Bank
- Consistency with Idaho Springs vision for I-70 and Advanced Guideway System (AGS) through the city
- Non-highway improvement strategies from the PEIS/ ROD
- Various highway widening projects, including interchange improvements, from the PEIS/ROD. Includes pre-planning for conceptual interchange configurations
- Clear Creek Sediment Control Action Plan (SCAP), water quality, stream enhancements
- Traffic Incident Management Plans (funding subsidies, supplemental resources, staged closures, etc.)
- Variable Message Signs
Studies in progress or concepts under consideration:

- Traffic and Revenue Study to determine viability of Public Private Partnerships to provide capacity improvements to the Corridor
- Advanced Guideway System (AGS)
- Westbound Twin Tunnels Expansion
- EJMT projects (Fixed Fire Suppression System, Continuous Flow Metering, portal/fan building roof repairs, hazmat trucks, etc.)
- Westbound auxiliary lanes from Bakerville to EJMT
- Public Private Partnerships
- Active Traffic Management and other Intelligent Transportation Systems
- Clear Creek Greenway

Other concepts from the PEIS/ROD but not yet underway:

- Westbound widening – Floyd Hill to Idaho Springs
- US 6/Base of Floyd Hill interchange configuration
- US 6/Base of Floyd Hill bridge replacement
- Clear Creek CR 314 extension from Hidden Valley to Base of Floyd Hill
- Georgetown Hill capacity improvements
- Empire Junction interchange complex
- Chain stations
- Complete diamond interchange at top of Floyd Hill

Other concepts not necessarily envisioned by, but neither precluded by, the PEIS/ROD:

- Other transit technologies (e.g., Bus Rapid Transit)
- Westbound Peak Period Shoulder Lanes
- Dumont Port of Entry operations
- Economic development opportunities throughout the corridor
- Frontage road issues (continuity, traffic diversion, congestion, etc.)
- Issues with intersecting State or County roadways (traffic diversion, incident management plans, emergency response)
- Devolution of state highways
- Signage and lighting (in general)
- Noise barriers (in general)
- Wildlife enhancements (in general)
- Funding initiatives
Locations you Value and would like to see Protected or Improved

Bakerville & Graymont Townsite
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Locations you Value and would like to see Protected or Improved

Floyd Hill & Idaho Springs

Jan. 7, 2014
Locations you Value and would like to see Protected or Improved

Georgetown
Locations you Value and would like to see Protected or Improved

Silver Plume
Locations you Value and would like to see Protected or Improved

Dumont, Downieville & Lawson & Empire Junction
Locations you Value and would like to see Protected or Improved

Wildlife
January 15, 2014
Open House

12:00 pm – 1:00 pm Answer questions on the background materials

Workshop

1:00 pm – 1:15 pm Introductions and plan for the workshop
1:15 pm – 1:30 pm Project Intent, Report, and Tools and Process
1:30 pm – 2:00 pm County History focused on I-70 Corridor with recent activities
2:00 pm – 2:30 pm Review existing plans and agreements for Clear Creek County and I-70 Corridor
2:30 pm – 2:45 pm Break
2:45 pm – 3:30 pm Small groups discuss the desired future
3:30 pm – 4:00 pm Small groups present their desired future
4:00 pm – 4:05 pm Wrap Up with tomorrow’s agenda

January 16, 2014 – Workshop

9:00 am – 9:30 am Review yesterday’s work
9:30 am – 10:00 am Small groups discuss County assets and opportunities discussion
10:00 am – 10:15 am Break
10:15 am – 11:30 am Small groups discuss strategies that build opportunities, create positive impacts and protect assets
11:30 am – 12:00 pm Review Issues and Measures of Success Hand out letters and discuss the activity after lunch.
12:00 pm – 1:00 pm Lunch
1:00 pm – 1:30 pm Review Evaluation System and 4 Corridor test project
1:30 pm – 2:30 pm Small groups review test project(s) with Asset and Opportunities Evaluation System
2:30 pm – 2:45 pm Break
2:45 pm – 3:45 pm Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the Asset and Opportunities Evaluation System
3:45 pm – 4:00 pm Wrap up discussion and next steps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Frei, Jr.</td>
<td>Mining Business Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Lanning</td>
<td>Central City, Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Brown</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hector</td>
<td>Dumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Acimovic</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Kruse</td>
<td>USFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Patton</td>
<td>Tourism Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Neely</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Combrink</td>
<td>Frontier Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Condon</td>
<td>Idaho Springs, Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Marquardt</td>
<td>Dumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Abrahamson</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Forsythe</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Ebert</td>
<td>Idaho Springs Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane Matthew</td>
<td>Recreation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Yearsley</td>
<td>CH2M HILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Gallaher</td>
<td>Gilpin-Clear Creek Home and Landowners Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Holm</td>
<td>Clear Creek Watershed Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Singer</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Williams</td>
<td>Vision Land Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Rockwell</td>
<td>Dumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Small</td>
<td>Dumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Ballard</td>
<td>Mayor Pro-Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Rapp</td>
<td>Mill Creek Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Lyssy</td>
<td>Silver Plume, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Rollenhagen</td>
<td>Clear Creek County, Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Frey</td>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Gaines</td>
<td>Central City Council Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim White</td>
<td>Solve, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ann Sorensen</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Muscatell</td>
<td>Floyd Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rice</td>
<td>Clear Creek Rafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Gamec</td>
<td>THK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Schell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Krebs</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Babeon</td>
<td>Fire Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Shanks</td>
<td>THK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Miller</td>
<td>Dumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larrice Sell</td>
<td>Dumont/Lawson/Downieville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Lancaster</td>
<td>Open Space Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Jeske</td>
<td>Dumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Leben</td>
<td>Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta LaRiviere</td>
<td>CH2M HILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Robinson</td>
<td>Easter Seals of Colorado, CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Anderson.</td>
<td>Fall River HOA, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Graybill</td>
<td>Georgetown Loop Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Levin</td>
<td>Mining Business Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Tableman</td>
<td>Open Space Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marv Geisness</td>
<td>Georgetown Promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jane Loevlie</td>
<td>Idaho Springs Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo Vobejda</td>
<td>CH2M HILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mel Andrews</td>
<td>EMERGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Urban</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hillman</td>
<td>Idaho Springs, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Raber</td>
<td>Bike Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Regester</td>
<td>I-70 Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Marcotte</td>
<td>Floyd Hill Homeowners, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolea Johnson</td>
<td>Emergency Response-Ambulance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omer Humble</td>
<td>Idaho Springs Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto Van Geet</td>
<td>York Gulch Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattie Hestekin</td>
<td>Bakerville Area Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Boat</td>
<td>Historic District Public Lands Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Winkle</td>
<td>Colorado Parks &amp; Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Stokstad</td>
<td>Executive Director, Economic Development Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Wu</td>
<td>USFS, Ranger District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Monson</td>
<td>EMERGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Buckland</td>
<td>County Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Adams</td>
<td>Upper CC Watershed Assn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Heern</td>
<td>Floyd Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Navarro</td>
<td>THK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Albers</td>
<td>Clear Creek County Sheriff's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Goodell</td>
<td>Loveland Ski Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Clark</td>
<td>St. Mary's POA, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Mahan</td>
<td>EMERGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Rossino</td>
<td>Historic Georgetown Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzen Raymond</td>
<td>Mile High Rafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Hosick</td>
<td>Henderson Mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Allen</td>
<td>Clear Creek County Road &amp; Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Mauck</td>
<td>Clear Creek County Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Rehder</td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Toohey</td>
<td>Trout Unlimited, West Denver Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Lancaster</td>
<td>Clear Creek County School District, Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Breslin</td>
<td>Clear Creek County, Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hale</td>
<td>Georgetown, Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hayden</td>
<td>Clear Creek County Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ty Petersburg</td>
<td>Colorado Parks &amp; Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Koch</td>
<td>Empire, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Goff</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Georgetown & Silver Plume

Georgetown - Present Day
Photo courtesy of: Clear Creek County Archives

Georgetown - 1920's
Photo courtesy of: Clear Creek County Archives

Georgetown and Silver Plume from Sunrise Peak - between 1899 and 1910
Photo courtesy of: Denver Public Library, Western History Collection, Call #: MCC-1168

Silver Plume from the East
Photo courtesy of: Clear Creek Archives

Georgetown
Photo courtesy of: University of Colorado, Norlin Library, McLean Collection

Georgetown looking West, c. 1880
Photo courtesy of: University of Colorado, Norlin Library, McLean Collection

Jan. 7, 2014
Dumont, Downieville & Lawson

Jan. 7, 2014
Empire Junction - Present Day

Clear Creek near Empire, ca. 1960
Photo courtesy of Denver Public Library, Western History Collection, Call # X-31161

Rydlund Empire Pass towards Alvarado
Photo courtesy of Clear Creek County Archives

The Peck House between 1900 and 1910
Photo courtesy of Denver Public Library, Western History Collection, Call # X-11456

Empire between 1870 and 1880
Photo courtesy of Denver Public Library, Western History Collection, Call # X-21844

Stagecoach near Empire Station - between 1860 and 1880
Photo courtesy of Denver Public Library, Western History Collection, Call # X-31161

Empire between 1870 and 1880
Photo courtesy of Denver Public Library, Western History Collection, Call # X-21844

Empire Junction - Present Day
Jan. 7, 2014
Construction of the Tunnels

Photo courtesy of CDOT

Johnson & Eisenhower Tunnels - East Portal - Present Day

Jan. 7, 2014
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