
Subject: Technical Team Meeting #9

Client: CDOT Region 1

Project: I-70 Peak Period Shoulder Lane

Project No:

Meeting Date: January 27, 2014

Meeting Location: CDOT Golden

Notes by: Lorena Jones

ATTENDEES: See attached sign-in sheet

DISTRIBUTION: Attendees, Technical Team Members, Project File

1. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Steve Long opened the meeting. Self-introductions followed.

2. PROJECT SCHEDULE

- a. Concept of Operations report—in final technical draft form.
- b. Environmental Analysis—wrapping up in the next two weeks.
- c. Open to Traffic—fall of 2015. May have to slip a little bit because of the constructability review; a little bit lengthier construction period because of weather, and there is a lot of paving that needs adequate time.

3. OTHER PROJECT EFFORTS

- a. Traffic and Review
- b. Twin Tunnels
- c. WB Tunnel Expansion is going ahead. Prep work in March; detour opening the following month. This does not include blasting.
 - i. There is confusion about what is actually happening in March, which is the heaviest ski month. Are we are looking at having traffic stopped before we have detour in place?
 - ii. Wide tunnel will carry westbound traffic. Detour will continue to carry eastbound traffic.
 - iii. We are getting farther away as we move north. The fear of blasting into the creek is lessened.
- d. AGS PLT meeting on Friday (1/31) morning. There will be a report issued to the PLT. It's in place right now. Getting comments in the next week and finalizing next month.
- e. CCC Transportation Visioning—had the visioning exercise last week; very well-attended.
 - i. Expecting to have a presentation of the workshop summary to the County Commissioners on February 11, with final report in March.

- ii. Help evaluate proposed projects proposed.
 - iii. The summary report will be helpful to the project team in getting the environmental analysis done. Copies will be available when it's finalized.
- f. Operational Pilot Projects
- g. Frontage Road/Local Network ITF—Had some consultants present who were able to give good summaries of what's going on now.
- i. Would like to see that access would be provided to businesses along the frontage road.
 - ii. Conduct information gathering, like traffic counts, to see where people are heavily accessing the frontage road from I-70—to have some ideas where metering should be best placed.
 - iii. Observation (Cindy Neely): Sunday (1/26) at 1:00 PM, the backup was mainly around the Empire Junction area. The rest of it flowed. Thanks to Twin Tunnels East. There is something that happened in Dumont, where the entrance ramp comes in. There was some slow down, but mainly right on Empire Junction to Georgetown.
 - iv. The PPSL will continue to alleviate that to make things free-flow.
 - v. There was an accident in Dumont on Saturday. Do we know what the story is about those accidents? There was also a four-car accident on Sunday. Might be good to understand what's going on right there.

4. **PARKING LOT**

- a. Define Interim
 - i. Andy was compiling an MOU with FHWA and HPTE. Incorporating some comment. Need more time to address comments. Will get the MOU out to the team before the next Technical Team meeting.
 - ii. There will be a white paper.
- b. Local Roadway Network
- c. Greenway

5. **CSS TRACKING SCHEDULE**

There was a change to the schedule. There will be a rail presentation today and talk about specifics, and lots more to come about aesthetics on SH 103 and East Idaho Springs Interchange.

6. **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**—nothing changed.

7. **CSS PROCESS**

8. **ISSUES TASK FORCE MEETING**

- a. Idaho Springs Workshop, 1/21/14
 - i. We changed the name to Exit 241 Interchange.

- ii. There was a meeting with the City of Idaho Springs regarding redoing that interchange. There was a lot of good input. Citizens and the business community having input about what to do with that interchange was appreciated.
 - iii. We don't know how to fund that yet. A lot of ramps will have to be rebuilt. If we can get the locals to help us make a decision on what makes sense there, it would really help because of the tight schedule. Steve Long thanked the mayor for helping with the process.
 - iv. There was a meeting with FHWA, and FHWA is definitely on board to make this happen also.
- b. Clear Creek Rafting Meeting, 1/9/14
- i. There are 3 CDOT projects (PPSL, WB TT, resurfacing of SH 103 from ___ to Mt. Evans) that we want input from the community. For the PPSL project, the traffic control plan will need to include maintaining access for the rafters. The bridge work is going to be occurring outside of the rafting activities to date.
 - ii. For the PPSL, annual permitting meeting where all the outfitters come to the meeting in March. There will be a forum where we can talk to a larger group of people in March.
- c. Constructability Review 12/18/14/
- i. CDOT use the constructability review on challenging projects, to help engineers and designers fine-tune the project. And to get their input on how we can get this project built in the time frame we want. There was concern about the tight schedule. Too short of a window to think we can open the PPSL in July. Came up with a schedule—the soonest we can open this probably would be mid-September. The realistic schedule would probably be October to mid-November. Still trying to figure out the time frame (opening of ski season and work to be done) prior to the fall peak. Right now, a lot of the roadway work could be done by fall color change. Would not impact traffic as much. Trying to fine-tune that a little bit.
 - ii. At the end of August, you have a drop off in traffic, but biggest months are going to be July and August, but there is that drop off time at the end of August. Mud season is spring. You drop off again heavily after the end of the fall color season.
 - iii. We have to think that our constructors are not going to be working on the weekends unless we ask them to work on the weekends. Trying to feel for the right balance before the beginning of the ski season.
 - iv. We'll be talking with CDOT more. The time frame could change. Is it okay to move this from July to September?
 - v. November is a low season all the way through Thanksgiving. Skiing doesn't really start until December.
 - vi. Need to be done paving by November. At our next meeting we will go through the construction schedule in detail.

9. ONLINE PUBLIC MEETING

- a. Starting to get more hits on it. The highest was on December 16 when we first opened it up. CDOT put it on its Facebook page also.
- b. Only 24 people so far had commented. Most are generally positive. Questions like why we need a toll and alternatives to be considered were brought up.
- c. Most people heard about it through word-of-mouth, social media, e-mail.
- d. Some people have asked for hard copies, so we have done that as well, probably about 10.
- e. Phyllis Adams: Visited the site and the comment page is confusing to me. On the first page, the comment box popped up, but not on the remaining pages. I wasn't able to comment anymore when I went on the other pages because I had already done it on the first page. I think maybe that should be checked. People should be able to access the comment page wherever they are on the site. Response: Yes, we will check that.
- f. Results
 - i. Web site peaked on December 16 with 130 Hits
 - ii. 37 Total Comments
 - iii. 24 Commenters
 - iv. 53 Comment Issues
 - ◆ General Positive: 14
 - ◆ Toll: 7
 - ◆ Alternatives: 7
 - v. 40+ Individuals Participated in the Polls
 - ◆ Social media and e-mail are best promotion tools
 - ◆ Safety is the most important issue: 14

10. PULLOUTS

- a. Two emergency pullouts—one in Dumont and one in West Fall River Road
- b. Required Length: 510 feet to 710 feet (including tapers)
- c. Required Width: 12 feet to 16 feet
- d. Should be paved
- e. Should be large enough to accommodate a tractor trailer unit and at least one piece of emergency equipment
- f. Location 3: Dumont pullout—This is one of the areas that local metering was proposed. Don't think many people are entering I-70 from that location.
 - i. As you come under the bridge, there is visual impairment, not seeing traffic.
 - ii. We will look at it more and see if there is anything else we can do. If there is an issue where traffic starts backing up a little, we need to have some kind of warning for motorists.
 - iii. West of Fall River Road—

- ◆ Even when we get free flow past US 40, we have been seeing back up here. Something to consider on this location.
- ◆ Good opportunity to clear accident out of the way, if there is an accident there, because of those curves.

11. INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS

- a. Looked at various environmental resources. The findings we have are all still preliminary. The table on the slide shows the resources and their respective impacts. Notice impacts are toward the low-end of severity.
- b. From endangered species standpoint, there might be some impacts to lynx but not likely to adversely affect.
- c. Looked at wildlife activity along the corridor. We are adding median jumps with little openings on the bottom on three locations.
- d. Very minimal impacts to wetlands. Temporary impacts at the Water Wheel area. When we reface the bin wall at SH 103 would be the only minor impact.
- e. PM₁₀ analysis that was done was related to vehicles miles travel. There will be some increases in vehicles miles of travel—removing travel from the shoulder time periods, so moving more of it into the peak periods. Increase in PM 10 will be well below the standard.
- f. Noise—we are anticipating decrease in noise and it will be perceptible.
 - i. Why is there indication of no impact? We would like to acknowledge that there is something beneficial that is happening.
 - ii. The way CDOT/FHWA sets the criteria for noise analysis, this project does not fit into the category that you would do a noise analysis. What we are going to do is include sort of a beefed-up discussion of that under the social and EJ section of the CatEx. Need to figure out how to best present that.
 - iii. In the past we have talked about mitigation and enhancement. It's an enhancement that we are doing in this project.
- g. Air Quality—people talk about respiratory illness especially in children—if you have technical information about that would be help. Yes, we will make sure to include that in the Cat Ex.
- h. Minimal impacts to riparian/vegetation. This will be replaced—it's a requirement of the SB 40 process that CDOT has with CPW.
- i. Hoping to get the Determination of Eligibility and Effects for historic properties out to the Consulting Parties sometime next week.
- j. No Section 4(f) uses; however, there will be temporary occupancy.
 - i. FHWA makes the final determination whether a use is Section 4(f) or not.
 - ii. If we reconstructing the Water Wheel, there would impacts to it. I wonder why we are saying no impact? The whole area around Lawson is historic and wouldn't we have impacts to that?

- iii. Idaho Springs was very clear that they didn't want us to shift north, so they wrote us a letter saying the park was not Section 4(f) because it is within the CDOT ROW and not considered significant for protection under 4(f).
- iv. You can have a park that is not a Section 4(f) property; not within the CODT right-of-way.
- k. Environmental Justice—there is a retaining wall at Lawson that will reduce noise by 2 dBA to 4 dBA.
- l. Still working on visual. Some of the discussion we will have later (related to signage and Exit 241) will help to inform the visual impact analysis. We don't think it's going to be a major visual impact.
- m. Next month we'll be looking at the CatEx vs. EA process that we have talked a lot in the beginning of the project.

12. SIGNAGE (ACCESS, TOLLING, ATM)

- a. Want to remind everybody that what we are trying to manage here is safety.
- b. All of these have different degree of effectiveness that we are trying to manage.
- c. First off, we do want adaptive traffic management, correct?
- d. We want to have dynamic tolling.
- e. Steps to Refinement:
 - i. Why do we need ATM? Main driving factor for having electronic signs over the shoulder is to help emergency vehicles use that lane during an emergency.
 - ii. Electronic sign so we can vary them for different messaging.
 - iii. In an urban setting, you would want these signs to be continuously visible, so we started with that. Then we checked it against the goal of the project and scaled it back. So we don't end up with a corridor littered with signs.
 - iv. Looked at where we identified historic properties and moved signs so they are not right in front of the historic properties.
 - v. Scott Thomas (Apex) went through the maps that were handed out to the attendees and discussed the different sign locations and visibility of those signs.
 - vi. Want to reemphasize where we are. If there is one sign in 10 miles, it is not very effective. What are the parameters?
 - vii. You would want people to be able to see signs for emergency closure. At the end of the straight-away before a curve. Three of every four people should be able to see an ATM sign.
 - viii. Steve asked if everyone is okay with the parameters. In these 10 miles, is it reasonable, based on the ATM assumptions?

- ix. Is it overkill? You are going from beyond 232 down to 240 in Idaho Springs. With camera poles and signs. Not counting at the first part of it or at the end of part of it. What's reasonable has to be balanced with the visual impacts of the corridor.
- x. We could do a sign every quarter mile and say this is what's absolutely necessary. It is difficult to say because you are also in a mountain corridor. It's been our experience that once you put up this sign, it will be lit 24/7.
- xi. Bringing it down to being able to see 75% is fair? Did you look at below that, like 50%?
- xii. Trying to balance the unfamiliarity of the drivers with the system. The idea is giving them enough warning. It was a trade-off.
- xiii. The team decided on 75% based best judgment.
- xiv. The every mile is not so much that because the curve in the highway is not evenly placed.
- xv. Talk about the risk, not so much frequency, but maybe the size of them. Could the same overall concept be accomplished with smaller lane use sign?
- xvi. Original concept was to use the smaller sign. But based on comment from the stakeholder, we sized this thing to have 9 characters across, with 3 lines. The first sign could medium, then small, small, and then medium. Still maintain the same frequency but maybe smaller signs. Try to consolidate structures and foundation as much as possible.
- xvii. Traffic in the left lane is the audience; is it possible to do a combination of less overhead and ground sign. Cut by a third or more and have some kind of supplemental ground sign.

The signs are to clear that lane for emergency response. We feel this is a big safety issue. The whole purpose of the ATM is how we get the emergency responders to the emergency location.

- xviii. If signs are too infrequent, you are pretty much duplicating the current situation. You will end up with the same situation, blocking more traffic to create a safe zone around that accident.
- xix. It wasn't the spacing of this that was the only thing considered. We looked at the viewshed. The 75% was the output rather than the input. It seemed reasonable. Need to get to the next point now—effectiveness, frequency, application. We definitely have some flexibility.
- xx. As a driver, the sign tells me there is an express lane in front of me, but not about a shoulder that is being temporarily used as an express lane.

When it's open, you got the sign saying that it is on the left side, 2 miles. When it's open, they don't need to know it's a shoulder. When it's closed, all the sign will say closed on it.

- xxi. The bottom lines are lit 24/7, it would say closed. The rest of the signs we can decide as a group. If there is an emergency, they will have red X's. Can have signs that say breakdown only or emergency lane only. We have an opportunity to shrink the face of these signs down.
- xxii. Coming on Dumont, you will need to be able to see that from the ramp, whether it's open or closed.
- xxiii. Overhead vs. on the side of the road will be looked at and see if that would be possible visibility-wise. Can have smaller sign size.
- xxiv. As a driver, an X is not going to do it for me. It needs to say what's going on.
- xxv. Do you have the ability to fine people if they don't comply? Have not looked into that yet, no automated means. That would be for local law enforcement to do as it is done today. We'll be able to track who is using it, and what speed people are using and can do some targeted enforcement.
- xxvi. Not for a lot of signs, but if it's a breakdown lane and you don't have proper signage, it could pose a problem.
- xxvii. The nice thing about having ATM is, it gives us flexibility. Are we still on the right path and the group is still okay that ATM is still the way to go? Yes.
- xxviii. Not our intent to have the signs lit all day.
- xxix. Not so much the number of signs; industry standard, does that assume that traffic is moving at slower speed and they are able to react to it? Or is it based on an accident that already happened? Coming back to Denver around 1:00 PM, about half a mile before we got to empire, traffic came to a halt. There was a sign that said 40 minutes it would take to get to the tunnel, but there was no indication that there was an accident. If there's an accident, is very quickly get backed up and come to a halt. If you have both lanes occupied, plus the PPSL occupied, how are you going to get an emergency vehicle through there and what does it take for people to effectively react to it?
- xxx. Need to make sure that we work with CDOT Operations; that they close the lane just as soon as there is an accident. And when people see emergency vehicles with lights flashing, they do obey and get out of the lane.
- xxxi. We are just operating on people's goodwill and trust they get out of the lane when they see the X's. Based on prior experience in other states, people do obey.
- xxxii. We'll go through the context of each one and look at it sign by sign and decide.
- xxxiii. Spacing and size that we have are based on national standards.

13. PROPOSED SIGNAGE

- a. Express Lane Entrance (*2 mile warning sign*)
- b. Express Lane Toll Sign—has a camera pole next to the sign, where it visually appears to be one structure.
- c. Express Lane Entrance (*1 mile warning sign*)

- d. Express Lane Entrance (*1/2 mile warning sign*)—consolidate the new sign, variable speed limit sign (scrolling signs to the different speed limits)
- e. Express Lane Entrance
- f. Express Lane Toll Sign—want to give people on the mainline a second chance to see the price in case they missed the first sign.
- g. Express Lane Only Sign (regulatory sign)—Looks more like a shoulder during off-peak. On 24/7. Red X during an emergency.
- h. ATM Signs
 - i. *West of Lawson*—same size sign (X), but could be a smaller sign or on the side; have some flexibility with this one. It was placed here because of the curve, and the spacing.
 - ii. *East of Lawson*—can we use a smaller sign? Yes, that is possible because the first 7 signs were medium. If an X is all that it will hold, then a small one would work. Spacing it with a larger sign makes sense.
 - iii. For the poles for these signs, if you put a smaller sign and then find out later that you need a bigger sign, could you replace it? That is a good point. Smaller pole is 500 pounds (5' x 5'), a larger pole is 2500 pounds.
 - iv. Having a default mode of smaller sign is a little risky. Keep in mind and think about how this whole architecture is going to be used to manage this corridor. Accident ahead, one mile, left lane blocked—those are normally the signs you see when there is an accident.
 - v. We are noting everyone's ideas about having smaller signs but it doesn't necessarily mean it's what we are doing. We will take the idea and figure out if it makes sense.
 - vi. ATM Sign (Sta. 576+00)—could be a smaller sign.
 - vii. ATM Sign (Sta. 631+00)—large sign
- i. We got some good ideas. A lot of work to be done to rework this and move signs and reduce size of some signs.
- j. We reduced 2/3 of the signs to small from medium, even though the number of signs are pretty much the same.
- k. Will go back and look at it and look at where the crashes are to make sure we are not taking out a sign in the vicinity of that. Will modify our sign table and email the table back to the group.
- l. Would there be a big difference because of wind loading? That is correct. These 5' x 5' panels cannot be in the median or we don't want them in the median? Does it matter from a visual standpoint? Three votes for overhead, is it a big deal? The smaller size makes a big difference for overhead.
- m. For the next version, we would call it a refined signage plan.
- n. We are going to end up consolidating our equipment on these poles.

- o. The cameras need to be mounted considerably higher than the signs, so we can't put the camera on the same structure as the sign.

14. **SH 103 INTERCHANGE**—Pedestrian Railing on SH 103

- a. Intent is to protect motorists below from snow and objects, protect pedestrian and bicyclist on SH 103 bridge, and provide an aesthetic element. This will also apply to what is now the Exit 241 bridge.
- b. Design standards is 2" max opening, 7'10" minimum height, with bridge rail.
- c. *Standard Pedestrian Rail* (vinyl coated chain link with Type 7 barrier and no columns)—Would meet the pedestrian rail requirements and design standards, but does not meet the aesthetic guidelines.



Standard Pedestrian Rail

- d. *Picket Pedestrian Rail* (iron pickets with Type 7 barrier, no columns)—Possibility is the picket rail and jersey barriers on the bottom to protect from the snow, so objects and snow will not fall through. Will hold up better, robust design, and easier to maintain over the long term. Meets pedestrian rail requirements, design standards, and aesthetic guidelines with some alteration.



Picket Pedestrian Rail

- e. *Option 1: Straight rail*—open rail, Type 10, maintains the horizontal lines. The only issue is the terminus—does not adhere to the aesthetics.



f. *Option 2: Single Curve Rail*—meets CDOT’s aesthetic guidelines



- g. *Option 3: Double Curve Rail*—also meets CDOT’s aesthetic guidelines.



- h. The last two options look great.
- i. There will be cost difference between the two because there are more materials.
- j. As you cross the creek, don’t know if we have room for that much transition down.
- k. For Option 2, need to consider that the rail is supported by the concrete. If you are beyond the wing wall, the soil will have some movement, which will be a problem later. Shift the wing-wall. The height concern is over the highway.

We can work on the detail later. What we want is to get input from the stakeholder on the type of railing.

- i. Solid at the bottom with Option 2 is what the group decided on.
- ii. Walkway would be on the west side. Maintain the Type 7 solid concrete bridge railing.
- iii. Both are 10 feet wide.

15. EAST IDAHO SPRINGS EXIT 241 INTERCHANGE

- a. Talked initially about lowering I-70. A few concepts:
- i. Existing Conditions: Concern with ramp moving at high speed; how to access the business; really awkward location, potentially dangerous

Existing Conditions



- ii. Option 1: Roundabout—Will consider what the community has experienced in the past.

Roundabout Option



- iii. Option 2: T Interchange

T-Interchange Option



- iv. What is the timing of 240 and 241 being replaced?

Part of same project, but we do not know of the timing. The 241 interchange will remain open while we work on the 240 interchange. It will be included in our construction phasing to not have both interchanges closed at the same time.

16. NOISE

- a. Type I Projects
 - i. The characteristics of the project entails we didn't need to do noise analysis. FHWA felt comfortable that this project does not fit into the Type 1 category (which is the category where you definitely need to do noise analysis).
 - ii. Will include in the CatEx enough information for the public to understand the issue about noise.
 - iii. When you look at the bullets on Type 1, the key element here is temporary. Want everyone to understand that if the trigger is pulled and this becomes permanent, the Type 1 category will apply.
- b. Highway Traffic Noise Regulations
 - i. Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) are categories of land use that define the allowable noise levels and threshold for noise mitigation.
 - ii. Want to emphasize, Category C does not include residential. Important to know that is not how FHWA evaluates traffic noise. They evaluate the ability to speak in an outdoor setting.
- c. Abatement Criteria—How to reduce noise when there is an impact identified.
 - i. All areas exceeding NAC thresholds must be considered for noise abatement.
 - ii. Noise modeling of barrier geometries determines the potential amount of noise reduction.
 - iii. All noise abatement must meet *feasibility* and *reasonableness criteria* to be constructed using federal funds.
 - ◆ Feasibility = constructability
 - ◆ Reasonableness = meeting the 3 mandatory FHWA criteria:
 1. Reduction design goal must reduce noise 7 dBA
 2. Cost benefit = cost of the wall divided by the number of decibels
 3. Benefited receptors = 5 dBA of benefit from that wall
 - ◆ If no feasible way to build a wall—do not pursue it. All three criteria are required to be met.
- d. Mountain Corridor Noise Research
 - i. CDOT Research Report—conducted literature search worldwide.

- ii. Modeled noise reduction effectiveness/distribution
 - ◆ Different wall configurations and orientations
 - ◆ Actual I-70 mountain topography
 - ◆ Reflective walls vs. absorptive wall treatment
- iii. Conducted modeling of noise wall scenario
- iv. Research modeling results show that as you move away from the wall you can create complications where you can see a little more noise being brought by the wall versus if there is no wall there.
- v. Retaining wall (Lawson)—can get a slight benefit; doesn't protect against truck traffic; will take 2 to 4 decibel noise reduction.

-BREAK FOR LUNCH-

17. GREENWAY

- a. Looked at all the segments of the CCC greenway and looked at what possible impacts might be to those.
- b. Temporary closure of some of the on-ramps while work is happening on those ramps. Short detour for people who drive to access the greenway.
- c. SH 103: There will be temporary construction impacts. One of them would be the closure of SH 103 itself. While it's closed, the ped/bike will be routed around and underneath the bridge and back around.
- d. While the Water Wheel Park is being developed, people will be routed up over the bridge. We make sure we don't end up closing both at the same time.
- e. Exit 241 vicinity: Still working on what impacts would be depending on what interchange reconstruction we'll be doing—if at all.
- f. Scott Lancaster Trail bridge: While work is happening just in in this immediate vicinity, there may be some access issues. We don't have the ped/bike going underneath something that has the potential to fall down. We make sure that there is still going to be safe access underneath I-70.
- g. We documented the temporary occupancy condition that the City and CCC had already agreed with in writing.
- h. Where do we get the time line for the SH 103 repaving between Idaho Springs and farther south?

Looking at a March advertisement of this year, which would put about a June date to begin construction. Not entirely sure, but we'll find out.

- i. Communicating with the community now is important so people know where to park if access to the parking lot just south of the SH 103 bridge will be cut off or restricted. We'll make sure we get that message out.

- j. For the whole route, we have all kinds of special events—like marathon. Our special events director has a list of what's going on. Need to coordinate with that person to make sure we communicate it.
- k. How about the Ride the Rockies, among others?

They have not released their route yet, but would be good to let them know.

18. OUTSTANDING ISSUES

- a. Drainage—Drainage is scheduled for the next TT meeting. Doing water quality features, putting in curbed sections, but not sure what we compare those against.
- b. Snow Removal/Maintenance—
- c. Barrier/Guardrail—It was not clear whether all of the barrier in Idaho Springs and Dumont will get replaced or saved. Right now, we are saving as many as we can for budget purposes.
- d. Class of Action
- e. Aesthetics
- f. Local Roadway Network
- g. Construction Phasing

19. EVALUATION CRITERIA

20. NEXT STEPS

- a. East of Idaho Springs (Exit 241 Interchange)
- b. Continue working on outstanding issues
- c. Bus on shoulder Introduction (today at 1:00 PM)

21. FUTURE TECH TEAM MEETINGS

- a. Monday, 2/24 at CDOT Golden
- b. Monday, 3/24 at Clear Creek School Commons Area

TECHNICAL TEAM ATTENDANCE ROSTER

Technical Team Meeting #9

Monday, January 27, 2014 (8:30 AM to 12:00 PM)

CDOT Golden - Trail Ridge Conference Room

INITIAL Attendance	NAME	AGENCY	E-MAIL ADDRESS	MAILING ADDRESS
<i>JA</i>	Adams, Phyllis	Upper Clear Creek Watershed Assoc. (UCCWA)	montanepros@juno.com	Box 1271, Idaho Springs, CO 80452
	Alhaj, Samer	CDOT	samer.alhaj@state.co.us	
	Arbogast, Belinda	CDOT Planning & Environmental	belinda.arbogast@state.co.us	2000 South Holly, Denver CO 80222
	Babeon, Kelly	Clear Creek Fire	kb@co.clear-creek.co.us	
<i>AB</i>	Ballah, Art	Colorado Motor Carriers Association	artballah@aol.com	
<i>RJB</i>	Bauman, Dick	CDOT	rdeab278@aol.com	
	Beazley, Sandy	HDR	sandy.beazley@hdrinc.com	
	Beck, Rick	Engineer, Clear Creek County	rbeck@co.clear-creek.co.us	
	Bemelen, Jim	CDOT I-70 Mountain Corridor Program	james.bemelen@state.co.us	425C Corporate Circle, Golden CO 80016
	Bordoni, John	Idaho Springs Public Works	pw@idahosprings.com	Box 907, Idaho Springs, CO 80452
	Bowes, Margaret	I-70 Coalition	mbowes@i70solutions.org	
	Brand, Rena	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	rena.j.brand@usace.army.mil	
	Breslin, Thomas	Administrator, Clear Creek County	tbreslin@co.clear-creek.co.us	
	Buckland, Phil	Commissioner, Clear Creek County	madcreek@ieee.org	
	Burns, Troy	CDOT Construction Engineer	troy.burns@state.co.us	
<i>SB</i>	Burton, Scott	Jefferson County	sburton@jeffco.us	
	Cheroutes, Mike	Director, HPTE	michael.cheroutes@state.co.us	
	Condon, Cindy	Idaho Springs	admin@idahospringsco.com	
	Conroy, Laura	CDOT	laura.conroy@state.co.us	
	D'Andrea, Maria	Transportation Engineer, Jefferson County	mdandrea@jeffco.us	
	Davenport, Lou	Apex	lou.davenport@apexdesignnpc.com	1675 Larimer Street, Suite 480, Denver, CO 80202
	Davidson, Thomas	Commissioner, Summit County	thomasd@co.summit.co.us	
<i>AD</i>	Drumm, Angie	CDOT Government Relations	angie.drumm@state.co.us	4201 East Arkansas Avenue, #275, Denver, CO 80222
	Duffy, Jason	Apex	jason.duffy@apexdesignnpc.com	1675 Larimer Street, Suite 480, Denver, CO 80202
	Duran, Rich	Captain, Colorado State Patrol	richard.duran@state.co.us	Colorado State Patrol, Troop 4-C, 202 Centennial Street, Glenwood Springs, CO 81601

TECHNICAL TEAM ATTENDANCE ROSTER
Technical Team Meeting #9
Monday, January 27, 2014 (8:30 AM to 12:00 PM)
CDOT Golden - Trail Ridge Conference Room

INITIAL Attendance	NAME	AGENCY	E-MAIL ADDRESS	MAILING ADDRESS
<i>DS</i>	Eidenmueller, Dan	Corporal, Colorado State Patrol	dan.eidenmueller@state.co.us	Colorado State Patrol, Troop 4-C, 202 Centennial Street, Glenwood Springs, CO 81601
	Farber, Nick	HPTE	nicholas.farber@state.co.su	
	Frey, Gary	Colorado Trout Unlimited	gbfrey@msn.com	1272 South Routt Way, Lakewood, CO 80232
	Gibbs, Dan	Summit County	dang@co.summit.co.us	
	Gibson, Stephanie	Environmental Manager, FHWA	stephanie.gibson@dot.gov	12300 West Dakota Avenue, Suite 180, Lakewood, CO 80228
<i>KG</i>	Grant, Kari	HPTE	kari.grant@state.co.us	4201 East Arkansas Avenue, #230, Denver CO 80222
	Greer, Matt	Structural & Hydraulic Engineer, FHWA	matt.greer@dot.gov	
	Griffin, M.J.	Summit County	mjgriffin@co.summit.co.us	
	Grissom, Joy	Colorado State Patrol (CSP)	joy.grissom@state.co.us	
	Gross, Al	CDOT R1 Centennial Residency/Hydraulics	alfred.gross@state.co.us	7328 S. Revere Parkway, Suite 204A, Centennial, CO 80112
	Haile, Solomon	CDOT Traffic	solomon.haile@state.co.us	
	Hailu, Azeb	CDOT Traffic	azeb.hailu@state.co.us	
	Hale, Tom		gtownadmin@earthlink.net	
	Halouska, Troy	CDOT DTD	troy.halouska@state.co.us	4201 East Arkansas Avenue, Shumate Building, Denver CO 80222
	Hattan, Dave	FHU/Safety	dave.hattan@fhueng.com	
	Hayden, Tom	Commissioner, Clear Creek County	clearcreektom@aol.com	
<i>JCH</i>	Heffron, Tammy	HDR Engineering/Bridge	tammy.heffron@hdrinc.com	1670 Broadway, Suite 3400, Denver, CO 80202
	Henderson, Vanessa	CDOT DTD	vanessa.henderson@state.co.us	4201 East Arkansas Avenue, Shumate Building, Denver CO 80222
	Hersey, Steve	CDOT Traffic	steven.hersey@state.co.us	2000 South Holly Street, Denver, CO 80226
	Hillman, Michael	Idaho Springs Mayor	mayor@idahosprings.com	
	Holm, David	CCWF	jdavidholm@gmail.com	
	Hurt, Joe	Colorado State Patrol (CSP)		
	Huyck, Holly	CDOT Planning & Environmental	holly.huyck@state.co.us	
	Hymas, Darren	HDR Engineering/Roadway	darren.hymas@hdrinc.com	1670 Broadway, Suite 3400, Denver, CO 80202
	Jensen, Randy	Program Delivery Team Leader, FHWA	randy.jensen@dot.gov	12300 West Dakota Avenue, Suite 180, Lakewood, CO 80228

TECHNICAL TEAM ATTENDANCE ROSTER

Technical Team Meeting #9

Monday, January 27, 2014 (8:30 AM to 12:00 PM)

CDOT Golden - Trail Ridge Conference Room

INITIAL Attendance	NAME	AGENCY	E-MAIL ADDRESS	MAILING ADDRESS
	Jepson, Dan	CDOT DTD Environmental	daniel.jepson@state.co.us	
NMJ	Johnson, Nicolena	Clear Creek EMS	nicolena.johnson@clearcreekems.com	PO Box 407, Idaho Springs, CO 80452
Span	Jones, Lorena	HDR Engineering, Inc./Project Assistant	lorena.jones@hdrinc.com	1670 Broadway, Suite 3400, Denver, CO 80202
	Klaetsch, Jennifer	CDOT Environmental	jennifer.klaetsch@state.co.us	
	Koch, Wendy	Town of Empire	wkbirdlady@aol.com	P.O. Box 100, Empire, CO 80438
	Kolkman, Laycee	HDR Engineering/Traffic	laycee.kolkman@hdrinc.com	
	Kouprievitch, Alexander	CDOT	alexander.kouprievitch@state.co.us	
	Kramer, Jay	CDOT ROW/Survey	jay.kramer@state.co.us	
	Krehbiel, Robert	Matrix Design Group/Hydraulics	robertk@matrixdesigngroup.com	
	Krueger, Don	Clear Creek County Sherriff's Department	webadmin@clearcreeksheriff.us	
	Kruse, Carol	U.S. Forest Service	ckruse@fs.fed.us	2150 Centre Avenue, Building E, Fort Collins, CO 80526
	Loevlie, Mary Jane	Idaho Springs	mloevlie@aol.com	
	Long, Steve	HDR Engineering, Inc./Transportation	steve.long@hdrinc.com	1670 Broadway, Suite 3400, Denver, CO 80202
	Luther, Beth	Clear Creek County	bluther@co.clear-creek.co.us	
	Marchese, Britton	HDR	britton.marchese@hdrinc.com	
	Martinez, Al	CDOT Maintenance	alfonso.martinez@state.co.us	
	Mattson, Brett	Colorado State Patrol (CSP)	brett.mattson@state.co.us	
	Mauck, Tim	Commissioner, Clear Creek County	tim@timmauck.com	
	McAfee, Gina	HDR Engineering, Inc./Environmental	gina.mcafee@hdrinc.com	1670 Broadway, Suite 3400, Denver, CO 80202
	McGhee, Ken	CDOT	ken.mcghee@state.co.us	
	McGuire, Brendan	I-70 Coalition	bm McGuire@vailresorts.com	
	Miller, David	CDOT	david.miller@state.co.us	
	Morgan, Jack	Mayor, City of Idaho Springs	morganmkt@comcast.net	
CCN	Neely, Cindy	Consultant, Clear Creek County	ccneely@yahoo.com	Box 532, Georgetown, CO 80444
	Noll, Thad	Summit County	thadn@co.summit.co.us	


TECHNICAL TEAM ATTENDANCE ROSTER
Technical Team Meeting #9
Monday, January 27, 2014 (8:30 AM to 12:00 PM)

CDOT Golden - Trail Ridge Conference Room

INITIAL Attendance	NAME	AGENCY	E-MAIL ADDRESS	MAILING ADDRESS
	O'Malley, Kevin			
Nto	Ogden, Neil	CDOT/I-70 Mountain Corridor Engineering	neil.ogden@state.co.us	
	Ortiz, Ty	CDOT	ty.ortiz@state.co.us	
	Pallante, Amy	Colorado SHPO	amy.pallante@state.co.us	
	Petersburg, Ty	CPW	ty.petersburg@state.co.us	
	Peterson, Jeff	CDOT DTD Environmental	jeff.peterson@state.co.us	4201 East Arkansas Avenue, Shumate Building, Denver CO 80222
	Pierce, Becky	CDOT DTD Environmental	rebecca.pierce@state.co.us	4201 East Arkansas Avenue, Shumate Building, Denver CO 80222
	Powers, Terrance	HDR	terrance.powers@hdrinc.com	
Rh	Rajasekar, Leela	CDOT Traffic	leela.rajasekar@state.co.us	
	Rice, John	Clear Creek Rafting Company	john@clearcreekrafting.com	
	Rice, Ryan	Director, CDOT Division of Operations	ryan.rice@state.co.us	
	Rothermel, Eric	FHWA	eric.rothermel@dot.gov	
	Ruble, Dave	CDOT Utilities	dave.ruble@state.co.us	2000 South Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222
BR, L	Ryer, Basil	CDOT	basil.ryer@state.co.us	
	Sakaguchi, Tracy	CMCA	tracy@cmca.com	
	Salamon, Mike	CDOT	michael.salamon@state.co.us	
	Salloum, Aymon	CDOT Planning	ayman.salloum@state.co.us	
SA	Schlaefer, Jill	CDOT DTD	jill.schlaefer@state.co.us	4201 East Arkansas Avenue, Denver CO 80222
	Schmid, Andi	CDOT R1/I-70 Mountain Corridor Program	andria.schmid@state.co.us	425-A Corporate Circle, Golden, CO 80401
	Schoch, Lisa	CDOT DTD Environmental	lisa.schoch@state.co.us	4201 East Arkansas Avenue, Denver CO 80222
HS	Schreiner, Tom	CPW	tom.schreiner@state.co.us	303-291-7327 6060 Broadway Denver 80216
JS	Scott, Jill	CDOT	jill.scott@state.co.us	
	Shanks, Kevin	THK Associates	kshanks@thkassoc.com	
	Shendleman, Terrene (Terre)	CDOT ROW	terrene.shendleman@state.co.us	2000 South Holly Street, Denver, Colorado 80222
	Singer, David	CDOT I-70 Mountain Corridor Environmental	david.singer@state.co.us	


TECHNICAL TEAM ATTENDANCE ROSTER
Technical Team Meeting #9
Monday, January 27, 2014 (8:30 AM to 12:00 PM)
CDOT Golden - Trail Ridge Conference Room

INITIAL Attendance	NAME	AGENCY	E-MAIL ADDRESS	MAILING ADDRESS
	Snelling, Bruce	Clear Creek County Sherriff's Department	bsnelling@clearcreeksheriff.us	
	Sohbi, Saeed	CDOT		
<i>JS</i>	Sorensen, JoAnn	Land Use Director, Clear Creek County	jsorensen@co.clear-creek.co.us	
	Stewart, Dave	CDOT ROW/Survey	davida.stewart@state.co.us	425-A Corporate Circle, Golden, CO 80401
	Stiegelmeier, Karn	Commissioner, Summit County	karns@co.summit.co.us	
	Swartout, Sue	CDOT	sue.swartout@state.co.us	
	Swenka, David	CDOT	david.swenka@state.co.us	
	Thomas, David	CDOT Geotech	david.thomas@state.co.us	4670 Holly Street, Unit A, Denver, CO 80216
	Thomas, Scott	Apex	scott.thomas@apexdesignnpc.com	1675 Larimer Street, Suite 480, Denver, CO 80202
	Tordonato, Francesca	CDOT Planning & Environmental	francesca.tordonato@state.co.us	425-A Corporate Circle, Golden, CO 80401
	Urban, Melinda	Operations Engineer, FHWA	melinda.urban@dot.gov	
	VanAuken, Krista	HDR Engineering/Public Involvement	krista.vanauken@hdrinc.com	1670 Broadway, Suite 3400, Denver, CO 80202
	Wang, Trever	CDOT	shingchun.wang@state.co.us	
	White, Stephanie	HDR Engineering/Public Involvement	stephanie.white@hdrinc.com	1670 Broadway, Suite 3400, Denver, CO 80202
	Winkle, Paul	CPW	paul.winkle@state.co.us	
	Wohlers, David	Idaho Springs Police Department	policechief@idahospringsco.com	
	Yip, Steve	CDOT Staff Bridge	man.yip@state.co.us	4201 East Arkansas Avenue, Shumate Building, Denver CO 80222
	<i>Miller, Dave</i>	<i>HDR</i>	<i>david.miller@hdrinc.com</i>	

NAME TAG :

- 1) Dave Miller
- 2) Susan Al-Laj
- 3) Ryan Rice