

DRAFT

Subtopic E2: Local Access and Mobility

Twenty-five public and agency comments were received for the E2: Local Access and Mobility subtopic. From those 25 comments, 9 common concern statements were developed. Themes associated with the E2: Local Access and Mobility subtopic include:

- The Draft PEIS did not address dispersion of travelers from transit stations to Corridor destinations.
- The Draft PEIS did not address impacts from the Highway alternatives on local roads and communities.
- Several items should be addressed in the PEIS, namely, assistance to local transit systems for connections to ski resorts, trailheads, and fishing areas; improvements to local transportation infrastructure such as constructing new frontage roads and improving existing frontage roads; and inclusion of mitigation plans to address local access, mobility, safety, and privacy for residents.
- The Transit alternatives would not be viable because the local transportation infrastructure is not in place to provide transport to Corridor locations.
- Corridor frontage roads are already severely affected by traffic congestion and access issues.
- The Transit alternatives are more supportive of the local transportation infrastructure because there would be no need to accommodate more traffic or parking.
- A more equitable scheme for financing emergency services needs to be developed.
- Construction will have adverse effects on emergency services access and mobility, adversely affect travel for daily living needs, and disrupt nondiscretionary daily travel.

CCS No.	Transportation Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
Subtopic E2: Local Access and Mobility	
E2-a	<p>Local Transit Systems</p> <p>Transit alternatives are not viable because the local transportation infrastructure is not in place to provide transport to Corridor destinations. The Draft PEIS does not address dispersion of travelers from transit stations to ultimate Corridor destinations. In determining the preferred alternative, assistance to local transit systems for connections to ski resorts, trailheads, and fishing areas should be considered.</p>
E2-b	<p>Effect on Local Roads</p> <p>Many areas of the Corridor are limited by terrain and cannot expand transportation infrastructure to accommodate more traffic. The Draft PEIS does not address impacts from the Highway alternatives on local roads and communities, which would include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clogged Corridor roads and infrastructure generated by the additional traffic of Highway alternatives • Increased traffic and noise • Safety • Need for more parking and local transportation infrastructure • Air quality
E2-c	<p>Access to Idaho Springs</p> <p>HOV/HOT lanes (associated with the Reversible/HOV/HOT Lanes alternative) would have limited exit/entry points, bypassing Idaho Springs and would, therefore, limit access to Idaho Springs businesses and the ability of local residents and emergency services to use the HOV/HOT lanes.</p>

DRAFT

CCS No.	Transportation Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
E2-d	<p>Benefits of Transit Alternatives</p> <p>Transit alternatives would offer the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AGS alternative should include transit centers at ski resorts, including Keystone, Breckenridge, and Copper Mountain. • Transit alternatives are more supportive of local transportation infrastructure because there would not be the need to accommodate more traffic or more parking. • Transit alternatives would also support local smart growth initiatives.
E2-e	<p>Frontage Roads</p> <p>Corridor frontage roads (such as County Road 308, Dumont, US 40) are already severely affected by traffic congestion and access issues (for residents and other travelers) during weekends. As a result, the PEIS should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of new frontage roads (such as to Empire Junction) • Improvements to existing frontage roads (such as County Road 308) • Mitigation plans for these areas to address local access, mobility, safety, and privacy for residents
E2-f	<p>Emergency Services</p> <p>Alternative construction will adversely affect Corridor emergency services and maintenance equipment access and mobility. This is of concern in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bicycle path between Georgetown and Silver Plume • East Idaho Springs to the Floyd Hill frontage road • Fall River/St. Mary's frontage road
E2-g	<p>Silver Plume Interchange</p> <p>The following are of concern regarding the design/movement of the Silver Plume interchange:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interchange design should be sensitive to Corridor tourist attractions and business access and mobility, such as the Silver Plume historic railroad and businesses. • Moving the interchange will affect emergency response times.
E2-h	<p>Daily Travel During Construction</p> <p>Construction anywhere along the I-70 segments in Clear Creek County will adversely affect travel for daily living needs as well as disrupt nondiscretionary daily travel. To provide improved local access and to reduce congestion in work zones, construction of Transit alternatives should be coordinated. Rental car operators at transit stations could also provide local mobility.</p>
E2-i	<p>Allocation of Emergency Expenses</p> <p>A more equitable scheme for financing emergency services needs to be developed. Clear Creek County residents pay for the services provided in their county, but more emergency calls are to I-70 than any other location.</p>