

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

COST ESTIMATING ISSUE TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

► **Meeting Date:** *February 25, 2014* ► **Time:** *9:30 am – 12:00 pm*

► **Meeting Place:** *Idaho Springs Elks Club, Idaho Springs CO*

► **Distribution / Attendees:**

Cost Estimating Issues Task Force

Name	Agency	E-mail	Check if Present
Ben Acimovic	CDOT Region 1	benjamin.acimovic@state.co.us	X
Cindy Neely	Clear Creek County	ceneely@yahoo.com	X
Hans Hopp	Parsons	hans.hopp@parsons.com	X
Jen Babbington	Parsons	jen.babbington@parsons.com	X
Joseph Kracum	Parsons	joseph.kracum@parsons.com	X
Julia Barker	Parsons	julia.barker@parsons.com	X
Malinda Reese	Apex Design	malinda.reese@apexdesignpc.com	X
Matt Greer	FHWA	matt.greer@dot.gov	X
Mike Hillman	Idaho Springs	mayor@idahospringsco.com	X
Phil Hoffman	Parsons	phil.hoffman@parsons.com	X
Ralph Trapani	Parsons	ralph.trapani@parsons.com	X
Red Robinson	Shannon & Wilson	rar@shanwil.com	X
Sara Richardson	Parsons	sara.richardson@parsons.com	X
Scott Thomas	Apex Design	scott.thomas@apexdesignpc.com	X
Wendy Wallach	Parsons	wendy.wallach@parsons.com	X

Cost Estimating Issues Task Force Meeting Notes

Topic #1 - Introductions

Ben Acimovic (CDOT) kicked-off the meeting. Self introductions were made. The agenda was reviewed.

Topic #2 – Level 1 Process Overview & Alternatives & Cost Estimating Process

Ben Acimovic (CDOT) gave the Level 1 Process Overview:

- Alternatives Level 1 cost estimates have been developed and will be reviewed today. The team is soliciting input from the Cost Estimate Task Force today and the Technical Team tomorrow.

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

Cost Estimating Issues Task Force Meeting Notes

- We are currently on Step 5 of the CSS Process “Evaluate, Select, Refine Alternative or Option”.
- Upcoming schedule includes March PLT review of alternatives’ costs, and April PLT review of screening.

Sara Richardson (Parsons) reviewed all thirteen alternatives under consideration:

- These thirteen alternatives include: 2 Managed Lanes (2 options), 3 Managed Lanes (3 options), PEIS Minimum Improvements (4 options), PEIS Maximum Improvements (2 options), Permanent Peak Period Shoulder Lane, Temporary Peak Period Shoulder Lane.

Ralph Trapani (Parsons) described the cost estimating process:

- Developed general concepts for capital costs that included roadway, structures, tunnels, transit, CDOT unit costs, allowance for unallocated items (known items but not quantifiable), allowance for CSS factor (15%), and AGS system costs from CDOT AGS Feasibility Study (February 2014), Preconstruction & Administration (NEPA, design, CSS, construction engineering), and Operations & Maintenance costs.
- Ralph asked Ben to describe the process used to derive the CSS factor. Ben summarized the process which primarily consisted of looking at other projects along the corridor and breaking out what portion of the costs was used to address CSS and then averaging these for an average percentage used to address CSS.
- Validated costs using Transportation Risk and Uncertainty Estimating (TRUE) method. This method takes a comprehensive look at the project, employing a collaborative team approach that focuses on key issues. This method helps to quantify uncertainty, apply risk management strategies, and document estimated costs. A monte carlo simulation calculates thousands of scenarios, and develops a probability distribution curve for each alternative’s cost.

Topic #3 – Alternatives Costs

Ralph Trapani (Parsons) discussed each alternatives costs:

- Costs ranged from \$4-5B for managed lanes alternatives, \$1-2B Minimum Program + \$6.8B AGS alternatives, \$2-3B Maximum Program + \$6.8B AGS alternatives, and \$100M - \$2B + \$6.8B AGS Peak Period Shoulder Lane alternatives. The team clarified that the \$6.8 AGS cost is in addition to the project cost, not included within the total.
- Cindy Neely asked why the AGS cost was 6.8 when they had been hearing 5.8? Ben and Joe answered the 5.8 was capital cost only and not design, operation and construction.

Group Discussion regarding two questions:

1. Can we create a better alternative by mixing and matching elements of different alternatives?
2. What constitutes a good cost estimate?

Question 1 Discussion:

Cindy Neely (Clear Creek County):

- Cindy Neely opened the discussion by saying she was there on behalf of the County Commissioners as they had a conflict with their regularly scheduled meeting. She worked with all three commissioners to craft a response to the Cost estimating meeting materials that were being presented today and which had been sent out last week. She has approval from the Clear Creek County Commission to make these comments.. Cindy Neely noted the Commissioners could not clear their schedules to meet today.

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

Cost Estimating Issues Task Force Meeting Notes

- Clear Creek County Commission thanks Ben Acimovic for his personal effort in leading this project, but it takes more than one person to perform a Collaborative Effort.
- Clear Creek County Commissioners feels this has not been a collaborative process or followed the I-70 CSS process thus far.
- Clear Creek County Commission from the inception of the project in October 2012 has let CDOT know that the Parsons Proposal is not acceptable. They continue to feel this way.
- At the December 5th, 2014 PLT meeting, CCC asked “Why are we proceeding with alternatives that are untenable to the counties? This was not addressed by CDOT.”
- Clear Creek County Commission maintains the position that county does not want managed lanes alternatives. These comments were made at various meetings, but Clear Creek feels they were not documented.
- Clear Creek County Commission states there needs to be a better alternative. The addition of 60-foot of pavement width is not acceptable, no matter what the facts and figures from the study say.
- Clear Creek County Commission does not favor any alternatives that preclude high speed transit. BRT is not an alternative to rail?
- Clear Creek County Commission(CCC) feels that it is clear that Managed Lanes alternatives are being pushed. They are opposed to managed lanes alternatives 1 and 2. CCC feels that they have not been given a “say” in the matter and that it will be selected using a 50 year non-compete contract. She said she spoke to Joe Mahoney in the Office of Major Projects at the 12/5/13 PLT meeting and told her about using the non-compete contract and that is a P3 project. Ben Acimovic cautioned that no decision has been made, that that may not be the case, and that Joe Mahoney does not speak for the project.
- Clear Creek County Commission believes strongly that CSS is not an add-on, it should be completed throughout the process. They are looking for a whole different approach to design.
- Clear Creek County Commission thinks the Cost Estimating ITF is not really a task force; feels that we have finalized this presentation made and we are not really looking for input. Ben asked the Idaho Springs Mayor Hillman if he had additional comments. Mayor Hillman stated that he has not really been involved so doesn't want to say too much. He felt the Clear Creek County Commissioners are in agreement with Cindy's statements though.

Questions 2 Discussion:

Cindy Neely (Clear Creek County):

- The County is not challenging the cost estimate numbers, they are challenging what alternatives we are looking at.
- She is disappointed and feels the PLT has not led the project, but instead the internal project team has led the project.

Matt Greer (FHWA) will share Cindy's concerns with his office. Ben will share concerns with David Singer and Tony DeVito at CDOT.

No further discussion/clarifications/questions on any items.

Ben Acimovic concluded meeting.

Powerpoint presentation will placed on CDOT project website.

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

These notes are an interpretation of discussions held. Please provide any additions or corrections to the originator within seven days of the date signed, otherwise they will be assumed correct as written.

► *Prepared By:* Jen Babbington – Parsons *Date:* 02-25-14

Next Meeting: None scheduled for this combined ITF group to date.

Attachments: The following attachments were provided as supplemental information prior to the meeting on February 19, 2014: Level 1 Base Cost Estimates (draft 2/17/14) and Level 1 Summary Cost Estimates (draft 2/17/14).