



PROJECT LEADERSHIP TEAM KICKOFF MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE: APRIL 18, 2013

I-70 EB PEAK PERIOD SHOULDER LANE

PROJECT NO: NHPP 0703-401

PROJECT CODE: 19474

1. INTRODUCTIONS AND AGENDA

- Jim Bemelen welcomed everyone and introduced the project team.
- David Singer asked the group to introduce themselves and state what they would like to see accomplished from this project. The group responded as follows:
 - David Singer stated that he would like to see a project that can build upon past successes.
 - Jack Morgan said he would like to get it done. He has heard bad news about AGS and not sure what the status is of that project. He stated that Idaho Springs is not responsible to handle traffic throughout the corridor, and that we all should approach this project with a positive attitude and not a negative one.
 - Jim Bemelen stated that the Executive Director has an ambitious schedule, so he would like to see a successful project that meets that schedule.
 - Brendan McGuire stated that the I-70 Coalition has not said that they are for or against this project, but he is happy to be a part of it and the process.
 - Melinda Urban stated that she wants to see the continued use of CSS.
 - Ben Acimovic said that he is here to help the team.
 - Tom Hayden stated that he is here to learn and listen.
 - Tim Mauck stated that he and Tom Hayden are not the PLT representatives for Clear Creek County, but that he wants to learn and listen throughout the process and to find out if it this project meets the ROD.
 - Cindy Neely stated that she is a champion of CSS, adhering to the ROD, and moving forward. She stated that she needs clarity about what this project is. She asked if we are looking at the feasibility of the project or an actual construction project.
 - Dan Gibbs said that he is happy to be here representing Summit County. He stated that he is a proponent of CSS. He said that he was able to go to Minnesota to see the Hard Shoulder Running projects in that state and is

interested to see if it is feasible here (in a non-urban setting).

- Angie Drumm stated that she would like to see this project capitalize on the Twin Tunnels project and help meet the expectations of the Executive Director and the local governments.
 - Randy Jensen stated that he is excited to see the group continue to work together and practice CSS because the groups that come together and get a project done are the ones that get the funding.
 - Tom Hale said that he would like to see this project make the community as user friendly as possible and help people use the assets in Clear Creek County.
 - Solomon Haile said that he is first here to support the mission of CDOT and learn about the stakeholders and their concerns.
 - Andi Schmid stated that she is new to the I-70 Mountain Corridor team and is also excited to get to know the stakeholders and learn about their concerns. She said that she wants to see a successful project that gets completed and build upon past successes of previous project.
 - JoAnn Sorensen stated that she wants to reinforce the understanding of what the project is.
 - Phyllis Adams said that she is here to observe.
- Andi Schmid introduced the project team and stated that the project will be partially designed by CDOT and partially designed by the consultant. She stated that she and David will be working with both the CDOT project staff and the consultant staff throughout the design.
 - Andi listed the PLT members and the alternatives and asked if there are any changes that need to be made to the list. Randy Jensen asked to be listed as the alternate for FHWA. Dan Gibbs stated that he will email Andi with the name of his alternate.
 - Jack Morgan stated that several people are included in the PLT including both elected officials and stakeholders. He stated that the elected officials have a responsibility to represent their constituents and not just the individual agenda of specific stakeholders.
 - Cindy Neely stated that Clear Creek County has not agreed that they will endorse this project. She said that doesn't mean they will not endorse the project.

2. PROJECT OVERVIEW AND FEASIBILITY STUDY RESULTS

- Andi stated that this project is not just to determine the feasibility of PPSL; she stated that this project is the design and construction of the I-70 Eastbound Peak Period Shoulder Lanes. She stated that the concept of PPSL is not new, and listed the reports and studies that this project built upon. Cindy Neely said that the PEIS and ROD are listed as the documents and that those are legal documents while the others are just studies. She said that she does not know if this project adheres to the ROD. Randy Jensen stated that they have discussed this and FHWA believes that the project does meet the requirements of the ROD and that he will provide

further clarification of this in the future. Cindy Neely asked to get that clarification in writing.

- Andi summarized the project location and overview, stating that both the inside and the outside shoulder lane options are being considered.
- Andi explained the results of the feasibility study and explained the heat diagrams and they are based on the completion of Twin Tunnels. Cindy Neely stated that there is still red (low speed) areas show by EJMT in the diagrams and that we are essentially just pushing the problem up the corridor. Andi stated that we are not pushing the problem upstream because the addition of the PPSL does not increase congestion at the EJMT, but that PPSL simply does not solve the congestion problem that far upstream.
- Andi stated that the feasibility study shows that PPSL is feasible from a traffic operations perspective and that further discussion is needed during the process to discuss other considerations. Cindy Neely asked if everyone on the PLT received the feasibility study. Andi said yes. Cindy encouraged everyone to read the study.
- Andi reviewed some of the design issues that have surfaced from looking into this project and its feasibility. She explained one option with a cross-section of 38 ft. Cindy asked what the proposed cross-section will be. Andi stated that they do not have a proposed cross-section at this point and that is something we will have to determine at the technical team meeting. Andi stated that it will depend on what FHWA is comfortable with regarding shoulder widths. Andi stated that the proposed cross-section will possibly be between 40 ft and 42 ft. Cindy asked if the majority of the project area is 38 ft. Andi stated that there are some areas that are wider than 48 ft but the exact locations are to be determined. Randy stated that the standard typical section for the highway when it was built was 38 ft.
- Cindy asked how many structures are located within the project limits. Andi stated that there are 14 structures, 8 of which are interchanges. Andi stated that structure F-14-E (bridge carrying SH 103) will need to be replaced because the width from pier to pier is approximately 35 ft. She said that there is a possibility that more bridges will need to be replaced. Randy asked what the structural deficiency rating for that bridge is. Andi stated that it is 62.

3. PLT OVERVIEW AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- David described the outcomes of this PLT Kickoff meeting and explained that he hopes to get a draft context statement and core values that we can finalize within the upcoming weeks. He explained the roles of the PLT and reviewed who should be a member of the PLT.

4. CONTEXT STATEMENT

- David reviewed the draft context statement and the entire group discussed it. The result of that discussion is as follows:

Draft Context Statement:

The I-70 mountain corridor is Colorado's only east-west interstate and the primary access route from Denver to the mountains of western Colorado.

The roadway geometry through Clear Creek County is constrained, with narrow shoulders, tight curves, and bounded by Clear Creek. Improvements to the interstate in this area directly impact established communities as well as unique environmental, historic and recreational resources.

This segment of the corridor experiences heavy flows of eastbound traffic causing severe congestion and traffic delays during peak periods, especially at the I-70/US 40 interchange at Empire Junction.

Short term operational strategies need to be explored until funding for the corridor's ultimate vision can be implemented.

5. CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

- David reviewed the draft list of project goals and desired outcomes of the PPSL project. The group then discussed the list and added to it. The resulting list is below:

Draft Project Goals/Desired Outcomes

- Improve Highway Operations
 - Mobility
 - Safety
 - Reliability
 - Reduce travel time during peak periods
 - Tourism
 - Enable a positive experience for tourists and locals travelling through the corridor
 - Help provide a positive economic impact
 - Improve Emergency Response
 - Project open to traffic July 1, 2015 without sacrificing quality or the CSS process
 - Maintain the collaboration and communication successes of recent projects
 - Bring 21st century strategies into the discussion of the options
 - Obtain stakeholder endorsement
 - Set an achievable list of milestones throughout the process
 - Obtain necessary permits (1041, NEPA, etc.)
 - Environmental impact
 - Keep in mind waters, wildlife, 4F, 106
 - Environmental and visual impacts
 - Successful environmental review
- Tim Mauck stated that he has an issue with listing an arbitrary date as one of the project goals. He stated that doing this has caused problems for Twin Tunnels causing the project to go over budget and sacrifice quality. The Twin Tunnels

project was discussed. Andi asked if Tim had a problem with listing a date in general, or just that specific date of July 1, 2015. Tim stated he had a problem with listing a date that would sacrifice quality and cause problems because of an aggressive schedule. Angie stated that a completion date is important because it is a CDOT goal. Solomon stated that most projects have a clearly defined beginning and ending date. Randy stated that a clearly defined set of milestones should be incorporated to prevent problems with the completion date. The completion date goal of July 1, 2015 was included as a project goal.

- David reviewed the draft list of project core values for the PPSL project. The group discussed the list and came up with the following list:

Draft Core Values

- Safety
 - Emergency Response
 - Mobility
 - Reliability
 - Operations
 - Constructability
 - Community
 - Recreation
 - History
 - Tourism/Economy
 - Access
 - Environment
 - Clear Creek
 - Wildlife Habitat
 - Mining
 - Engineering Criteria And Aesthetic Guidelines
 - Balanced design using the CSS guidance
 - Aesthetics inspired by the surroundings
 - Sustainability
 - A project for today that blends with future possibilities
- Cindy asked what “blends with future possibilities” means on the core values list. She stated that there are no future plans for improvements in this area. She asked if CDOT is going to widen and construct 3 lanes. Jim stated that the PPSL project does not have enough width to come back later and just re-stripe it for 3 lanes. Melinda and Randy agreed. Jim asked if she is concerned that in the future we will run the PPSL during more times. He offered to come up with an agreement limiting the times when the PPSL can run.

6. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- David reviewed the roles and responsibilities of the Technical Team and other task force teams. The list of Technical Team members was reviewed and the following changes were agreed upon:
 - Change Cindy Neely's title to Consultant
 - Replace Captain Prater with Captain Duran
 - Replace KerryAnn McHugh with Tom Hale
 - Add Phyllis Adams
 - Add Thad Noll
 - Add Art Ballah from CMCA
 - Add CMTC Rep – Saeed Sohbi
 - Add Jim Deleo
 - Add Gary Frey
 - Remove Matt Sugar
 - Remove Mary Jane Loevlie
- It was also discussed that the Technical Team list will also be split up into Technical Team members and others (who are observing); similar to how the PLT list is split.
- David explained the draft list of issues to be addressed at the Technical Team meeting. The group discussed the list and came up with the following:

Potential Issues

- Signing
 - Safety: sight distance, shoulders and lane widths, pullouts, driver expectancy, lighting, enforcement
 - Aesthetics
 - Water quality
 - Bridge structures & clearance
 - Maintenance
 - Widening to the median or the creek
 - Environmental impacts
 - Id enhancements/ interests from issues task forces
 - Active management/control of operations
 - Design/construction phasing – 2 projects?
 - Transitions – how to start and stop the ppsl
 - What is interim?
 - Adherence to the peis/rod
 - Determining the proposed typical section
 - Emergency services
 - Concept of operations
 - Schedule
 - Community
- David listed the Issue Task Forces and asked if any additional ones should be

added. It was determined that the following were needed:

- ALIVE
 - SWEEP
 - SECTION 106
 - Communications
 - Aesthetics
 - Emergency Services
 - Operations
- David explained the Technical Team handout about how to approach Technical Team issues. He stated that the approach used for the Twin Tunnels project worked well and we plan to implement that approach, or a similar one, on this project.

7. OPERATING GUIDELINES

- David asked if there are any other suggestions to enable decision making. There were none.

8. CONCLUSIONS/NEXT STEPS

- David explained the schedule of the 6-Step Process for this project, showing that it should end this next spring. There were no objections.
- Andi asked the group to determine a monthly meeting time. It was decided that the group will meeting on the 1st Wednesday of each month from 9:00am to 12:00pm in Golden.

These meeting minutes constitute the entire content of the discussion and agreements reached. If there are errors, omissions, or inaccuracies in the minutes as documented above, please forward comments addressing the specifics to the author responsible for the preparation of the meeting minutes not later than 7 days from the date of issuance. Failure to comment within the 7 day open comment period constitutes acceptance by each participant of the minutes as written.

Responsible for Minutes:

Date:

Andria Schmid

4/19/13