



# FINAL MEETING NOTES

<b>PROJECT:</b>	24970 Cottonwood Pass Concept Design (Eagle and Garfield Counties)
<b>PURPOSE:</b>	Project Leadership Team (PLT)/Technical Team (TT) Meeting #1
<b>DATE HELD:</b>	June 30, 2022
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Videoconference
<b>ATTENDING:</b>	<p>CDOT: Karen Berdoulay, Jacob Rivera, Rob Beck, Drew Stewart</p> <p>Garfield County: Fred Jarman, Wyatt Keesbery</p> <p>Eagle County: Ben Gerdes, John Harris, Nicole Trujillo</p> <p>Town of Gypsum: Jerry Law, Jeremy Rietmann</p> <p>United States Forest Service (USFS) Eagle-Holy Cross Ranger District: Marcus Dreux</p> <p>Bureau of Land Management (BLM): Joe Fazzi, Jill Bogdanovich</p> <p>David Evans and Associates, Inc. (DEA): Kara Swanson, Leah Langerman, Sarah Rachal-Dormand</p>
<b>COPIES:</b>	PLT/TT Members

## Summary of Discussion:

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

- ◆ Jacob (CDOT Project Manager) welcomed the group and explained DEA is the consultant on the team.

### 2. Project Background and Scope

- ◆ The purpose of the project is to improve safety for local traffic on Cottonwood Pass.
  - ◇ Cottonwood Pass will continue to not be an official detour route for I-70, although it is understood that some people will use Cottonwood Pass if I-70 is closed.
- ◆ Eagle and Garfield Counties chose 14 specific areas/sites for improvements to be considered – six sites in Eagle County and eight sites in Garfield County. The project is focused on identifying spot improvements at those sites only, not improvements along the entire corridor.
  - ◇ Garfield County had decided to focus improvements on the Catherine Store route rather than other roads like County Roads 113, 114, and 115 due to existing conditions with narrow roadway, close proximity to homes, and no signalized intersection on CO 82 for the other routes, which makes any improvements more impactful and costly. The Garfield County Commissioners previously selected Catherine Store as the preferred route.
- ◆ Concept design – geometric design of potential improvements will be at approximately 10% level, which will be at a high level without many details, but should be able to identify constraints and magnitude of costs to be considered for future design scope and funding needed for projects.
- ◆ With the current schedule, most project work will be done by end of this year with final project report/documentation possibly extending into early next year.

- ◆ At the end of this project, the work products (i.e., survey, design, data, report) will be provided for the counties to move forward with next steps for funding, design, and construction.
- ◆ Survey will be completed with a drone to map the 14 sites in early August. The surveyors are also completing research of existing right-of-way to understand the private property boundaries.
- ◆ The project team is also collecting data about existing safety and traffic conditions, high-level geotechnical conditions, and a broad environmental evaluation (for wetlands, wildlife species, and historic resources). This information will help the team assess the design options at each site for safety needs, physical constraints, and red flags.
- ◆ One design concept option will be selected for each location to be designed to the 10% level.
- ◆ The process is expected to set the counties up to pursue grants as necessary to move forward.
- ◆ The roadway is a county facility and the counties would remain the ultimate decision makers on this project.

### 3. Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) Process

- ◆ Elements of the CDOT CSS process will be applied to this project, such as intensive stakeholder outreach.
- ◆ PLT/TT Overview and Responsibilities
  - ✧ Champion and lead the CSS process
  - ✧ The PLT/TT will be a combined group for project agency stakeholders to establish project goals and to make sure the project team is adhering to those goals as the project moves forward.
  - ✧ This group will also give input on the need for specific Issue Task Force (ITF) groups and help identify members.
  - ✧ Four meetings for the PLT/TT are planned. Agendas will be sent to members ahead of the meeting and other agency representatives can be added to individual meetings if/when needed.
- ◆ Context Statement
  - ✧ This statement is a way of capturing in words the special qualities and attributes that make the area of a project unique.
  - ✧ The draft Context Statement was sent to the PLT/TT group in an email yesterday. Comments can be sent by July 8<sup>th</sup> to Kara and Leah.
  - ✧ Comments/Discussion:
    - » Do not call out specific species (remove reference to Canada Lynx).
    - » Eagle County suggested adding to the Context Statement that CDOT is facilitating the process and counties and town are the owners of the project outcome.
- ◆ Core Values
  - ✧ This lists what is most important along this corridor. These values will be used to help evaluate design options.
  - ✧ Draft values are: Safety, Corridor Character, Natural Resources Preservation, Collaborative Improvements
  - ✧ Comments/Discussion:

- » Garfield County suggested adding a value of year-round access.
  - This possibility may be left open, but it is not a given outcome of this project. Maybe note not precluding future year-round access.
  - It hasn't been determined that Eagle County wants to work toward year-round access.
  - The group decided to not include year-round access as a Core Value.
- » USFS suggested adding a sub-bullet of aesthetics under corridor character.
  - This is important, but is there a way to define it since "aesthetics" are in the eye of the beholder.
  - CDOT suggested adding "Respect" before "corridor character".
  - Add sentence that this project is not meant to capture character of the overall Cottonwood Pass corridor, but these values will be how the specific 14 locations will be evaluated.

◆ Critical Issues

- ◇ Safety issues: They are specific to each of the 14 sites, and can include tight curves, narrow roadway, sight distance, no guardrail.
  - » Safety improvements will need to be balanced against the character of the road.
- ◇ Corridor Character issues: There are nearby homes/private properties and there is potential for visual impacts from improvements
- ◇ Natural Resource Preservation: Impacts to historic sites to be avoided
- ◇ Collaborative Improvements: None mentioned

4. Issue Task Force (ITF) Meetings

- ◆ Intent of ITFs is to focus on a topic that is a potential concern for the project.
- ◆ Project team has initially identified two ITFs: property owner/residential, and natural resources.
- ◆ Property Owner/Residential – for homeowners, residents, and business owners to directly collaborate with the project team
  - ◇ Will meet three times to request/gather input on project information at key points in the process.
- ◆ Natural Resources
  - ◇ First meeting is planned for early September – will want name suggestions from PLT/TT.
  - ◇ Comment to call it "Natural/Cultural Resources" ITF
  - ◇ BLM noted the quicker the resources group gets together the better, since there may be timing limitations with field surveys.
    - » No field work is planned for this project, but understanding the timing limitations to document for future consideration will be helpful.
- ◆ The project team also plans to hold a meeting after developing concepts with the area emergency service providers to get their input, but it isn't considered a formal ITF since it is expected to be one meeting.

5. Communication and Operating Guidelines

- ◆ Any emails to the group should reference CDOT subaccount number 24970.
- ◆ Keep Karen and Jacob copied on emails as the CDOT Project Managers.
- ◆ Anything related to public and stakeholder outreach should go to Leah.

6. Summary of Public Engagement Plans

- ◆ Two main public engagement points are planned, each consisting of an open house meeting held in both Eagle and Garfield counties. The first round of public meetings is planned for July and the second in December.
- ◆ The first engagement point is to introduce the project and gather public input regarding existing conditions and draft Core Values.
  - ◇ Garfield County: Tuesday, July 19, 5:30 – 7:30 PM at Glenwood Community Center
  - ◇ Eagle County: Wednesday, July 20, 5:00 – 7:00 PM at Gypsum Town Hall Council Chamber
- ◆ To supplement the general public meetings, the Property Owner/Residential ITF group will meet three times throughout the project to discuss residential and property owner needs and gather input to inform decision-making.
  - ◇ Participation for this ITF will be solicited through a sign-up at the initial public meetings and on the project web page.
- ◆ Meeting advertisements
  - ◇ Postcard mailer – to approximately 2,500 properties
  - ◇ Media release – will be shared and distributed by CDOT, counties, and cities/towns
  - ◇ Project email list blast
  - ◇ Newspaper ad – considering Vail Daily, Glenwood Springs Post Independent, Aspen Times
  - ◇ Social media posts – by agency communications staff
  - ◇ Variable message boards – if desired by counties on their roads
- ◆ Leah asked that people send any interested party contact information or ITF invitees to her.
- ◆ Two-way information sharing throughout the project will occur through a project web page on CDOT’s website.

7. Next Steps

- ◆ Existing Right-of-Way Mapping
- ◆ Traffic/Safety and Environmental Evaluation
- ◆ Round 1 Public Meetings
- ◆ Property Owner/Residential Issue Task Force – mid-August

8. Other

- ◆ There is currently no funding for construction or design phase for projects.