

DRAFT

Subtopic D1: Construction Duration

Sixty-eight public and agency comments were received on the D1: Construction Duration subtopic. From those 68 comments, 9 common concern statements were created. Themes for the D1: Construction Duration subtopic include:

- The assessment of the construction period is inadequate in relation to impacts, community concerns, and construction management.
- The Draft PEIS did not adequately assess the environmental, social, and economic impacts that will result from the 15-year construction period or the impacts resulting from the loss of revenue.
- The construction impacts of the preferred alternatives would have significant negative impacts on the economy, environment, historic character, and quality of life for Corridor residents and the mountain resort and gaming communities.
- The AGS alternative would provide a way to avoid 15 years of construction because AGS could be built in 5 to 6 years with fewer social and economic impacts.
- The construction timeframe should be compressed.
- The Draft PEIS lacked a specific construction schedule.
- Other concerns included congestion, disruption from constructing the Black Hawk Tunnel, and impacts on other route, and the effects on tourism, Clear Creek County, and Winter Park.

CCS No.	Construction Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
Subtopic D1: Construction Duration	
D1-a	<p>Inadequate Assessment of Construction Period</p> <p>The following issues relate to the adequacy of the assessment of the construction period presented in the Draft PEIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft PEIS does not adequately assess: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • environmental, social, and economic impacts that will result from the 15-year construction period; or • the impacts resulting from the loss of revenue from loss of business, loss of tourism, and safety impacts due to a lack of alternate routes during the construction period; • The Draft PEIS does not disclose the impacts from 15 years of construction on travel, property, the economy, and life in general. • The Draft PEIS does not discuss the impacts that would result from shifting traffic to other routes like US 285 and SH 9. • The Draft PEIS does not address the concerns of the communities most affected by construction that are opposed to highway widening, which include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those communities most affected by construction should be allowed to vote on their future rather than having highway widening imposed on them. • Further study and analysis are required to understand the effects of construction on these communities in Tier 1 before an alternative is selected, not during Tier 2. Construction impacts and their mitigation strategies should be evaluated in detail during Tier 2 studies. • Highway alternatives would be costly and lengthy, cause delays, disrupt businesses and daily life, without offering any real benefit. • Highway alternatives also pose numerous challenges due to steep rock faces, narrow canyons, mineral deposits, and mine tailings, all of which could affect the water quality. • The Draft PEIS does not describe construction management for the alternatives or how mobility will be maintained during construction, including how the many negative impacts, such as commuting, travel times, businesses, and property values, will be mitigated; and • The Draft PEIS does not define what is meant by “operational,” although the Draft PEIS stated that the highway will remain operational during construction; based on projects such as SH 9 and Berthoud Pass, operational conditions could lead to impacts that are greater than what is shown in the Draft PEIS.

DRAFT

CCS No.	Construction Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
D1-b	<p>Early Deployment of AGS Alternative</p> <p>The 15-year cone zone depression caused by highway widening through Clear Creek County can be avoided by early deployment of AGS. AGS could be built in 5 to 6 years and would be much easier to tolerate than 15 years of highway construction. Because the AGS alternative would have a construction period less than 15 years, it would have far fewer social and economic impacts.</p>
D1-c	<p>Construction Effects on Tourism Economy</p> <p>Tourism will suffer during the 15-year construction period. Specific concerns include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mountain resort and gaming communities, which contribute significantly to Colorado's tourism economy, could be seriously affected by the extended construction period. • Because the construction period will be a 15-year traffic nightmare with no alternate route, the Western Slope tourism economy will be jeopardized. • Travelers will not exit the highway to visit a museum or historic resource when these attractions are blighted by construction activities. • The construction period will impair access to the mountains for 15 years and cost the Corridor economy \$15 billion according to the Draft PEIS.
D1-d	<p>Construction Schedule/Timeframe</p> <p>Concerns surrounding the construction schedule/timeframe include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 15-year construction period is too long. • There is no reason it should take 15 years to complete the project. • Every effort should be made to compress the timeframe due to economic concerns. • The Draft PEIS does not describe construction periods/schedules for the alternatives. • Differences in the schedules might make a difference in social-economic impacts. • The Draft PEIS does not provide a specific construction schedule.
D1-e	<p>Effects on Clear Creek County</p> <p>The following issues involve the discussion of construction effects on Clear Creek County presented in the Draft PEIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft PEIS erroneously dismisses construction impacts in Clear Creek County based on an east-west comparison of economies. • The Draft PEIS does not address the economic or environmental impacts from construction in Clear Creek County. Clear Creek County would lose the most due to construction impacts, such as 15 years of aggravation, forced evacuations, lost businesses and historic resources. Clear Creek County would gain no benefit from alternatives; as a matter of fact, some of the alternatives have the potential to destroy the county economy and livability. • The Draft PEIS does not accurately portray construction impacts on communities, residents, and businesses in Clear Creek County. • The Draft PEIS is misleading in respect to discussions of eastern versus western portions of the County.
D1-f	<p>Effects on Winter Park</p> <p>Construction will have an impact on Winter Park in that skiers and other travelers will be discouraged from traveling to Winter Park during construction due to increased travel times; as a result, other ski areas will become more desirable for residents and business owners. It is doubtful that many skiers would endure construction delays on I-70 to travel to Winter Park.</p>
D1-g	<p>Floyd Hill to EJMT</p> <p>As long as any part of the highway between Floyd Hill and EJMT remains four lanes, there will be no congestion relief; and the entire six-laning must be complete before any relief is seen, which is not projected until 2025. In addition, this assumes that work will begin in 2010, which seems highly questionable.</p>

DRAFT

CCS No.	Construction Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
D1-h	Black Hawk Tunnel The Black Hawk Tunnel will cause even more construction disruption if it is built, extending the construction period from 15 to 20 years.
D1-i	Impacts on Other Routes Construction congestion will shift traffic to other routes (US 285 and SH 9); and impacts on other routes were not considered in the Draft PEIS.