

DRAFT

Subtopic F8: Geologic Hazards

Eleven public and agency comments were received on the subtopic of F8: Geologic Hazards. From those 11 comments, 5 common concern statements were developed. Themes for the F8: Geologic Hazards subtopic include:

- There is no effective rockfall mitigation plan for the Georgetown-Silver Plume Hill and blasting in this area could result in rockfall incidents.
- I-70 construction activities will disturb rockfall hazard areas and either precipitate or hasten a potential fall that might imperil both life and property.
- The Draft PEIS did not explain why many in the preferred group of alternatives have the most severe geologic hazards or how geologic hazards were considered in alternative selection.
- There needs to be more screening and a complete disclosure of available mitigation options.

CCS No.	Environmental Sensitivity Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
Subtopic F8: Geologic Hazards	
F 8-a	<p>Mitigation at Georgetown-Silver Plume Hill</p> <p>Geologic hazards on Georgetown-Silver Plume Hill cannot be mitigated. Simply to increase the width and capacity of the freeway will only increase the risk to a greater number of drivers. A better idea is to tunnel either conventional underground tube or to create a “tunnel” artificially on the present footprint by stacking the east and west lane and covering overhead with a shield/shelter.</p> <p>The PEIS design plan is unclear in the Georgetown Hill area and does not specify if the road would cut further in the mountain or cantilever out over the valley.</p> <p>The PEIS does not include plans to improve safety in the Georgetown-Silver Plume Hill area that is subject to geologic hazards that have been deadly. It does not clarify whether a tunnel at the Georgetown Hill/Incline was considered to avoid geologic hazards.</p> <p>The “fencing” mitigation proposed in the Draft PEIS for the Georgetown Incline area is not an acceptable mitigation based on recent failure of such a fence; therefore, the PEIS should consider extensive rockfall hazard mitigation at the Georgetown Incline, including complete disclosure of all available options and a thorough screening process to identify the most effective option.</p>
F 8-b	<p>Rockfall Mitigation</p> <p>The Draft PEIS provides almost no discussion of mitigation measures for rockfall, even though the document states that extensive rockfall mitigation would be required. A context sensitive design, using colonnaded and covered lanes, would provide for lane widening and protection from rockfall hazard.</p>
F 8-c	<p>Highway Alternatives</p> <p>How would the Six-Lane Highway alternatives handle major landslides?</p>
F 8-d	<p>Alternative Selection</p> <p>The Draft PEIS does not explain why many in the preferred group of alternatives have the most severe geologic hazards or how geologic hazards were considered in alternative selection. Geologic hazard severity at Georgetown Hill should be used as a factor in alternative selection due to the safety concerns of Silver Plume residents.</p>

DRAFT

CCS No.	Environmental Sensitivity Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
F8-e	<p>Construction Impacts</p> <p>Although there is ongoing rockfall mitigation at Georgetown Hill, further construction activities are likely to cause more rockfall hazards. I-70 should not be widened in the Georgetown area because it will include blasting that could result in rockfall incidents, as has already occurred on Saxon Mountain Road. Blasting will increase rockfall risks for residents/homes that are downgradient of the “crack” in Saxon Mountain. Silver Plume has two areas of “perilous” rockfall hazard as identified by the Colorado Geological Survey that threaten areas of the town; and the town is concerned that I-70 construction activities will disturb the rockfall hazard areas and either precipitate or hasten a potential fall that might imperil both life and property.</p>