



FINAL MEETING NOTES

PROJECT:	24970 Cottonwood Pass Concept Design (Eagle and Garfield Counties)
PURPOSE:	Project Leadership Team (PLT)/Technical Team (TT) Meeting #2
DATE HELD:	August 30, 2022
LOCATION:	Videoconference
ATTENDING:	<p>CDOT: Karen Berdoulay, Jacob Rivera, Drew Stewart Garfield County: Wyatt Keesbery Eagle County: Ben Gerdes, John Harris, Nicole Trujillo Town of Gypsum: Jeremy Rietmann, Jim Hancock United States Forest Service (USFS) Eagle-Holy Cross Ranger District: Marcus Dreux Bureau of Land Management (BLM): Jill Bogdanovich David Evans and Associates, Inc. (DEA): Stacy Tschuor, Kara Swanson, Leah Langerman, Sarah Rachal-Dormand</p>
COPIES:	PLT/TT Members

Summary of Discussion:

1. Context Sensitive Solutions Process

- ◆ Round 1 Public Meetings held July 19 & 20
 - ✧ 59 people attended in Glenwood Springs and 44 attended in Gypsum.
 - ✧ Core Values input
 - » Opinions on comment forms and the “dot sticker” preference activity on the display board reflected that Safety is the most important Core Value, closely followed by Respecting Corridor Character. The next most important Core Value was noted as Natural Resource Preservation.
 - » Comment sheets completed privately showed different results than the dot stickers on the display board. The most important value noted on comment sheets was Safety, but Respecting Corridor Character was the most frequently chosen on the display board.
 - » A PLT member observed that stickers were frequently placed on Respecting Corridor Character at the Glenwood Springs meeting, and were more focused on Safety at the Gypsum meeting.
 - ✧ Comment themes
 - » Safety and Respecting Corridor Character are most important
 - » Speeding/trash/need for enforcement are common issues noted
 - » There are concerns that improvements will draw traffic, increase speeds, and ruin the rural way of life
 - » Some support for safety improvements for locals and to allow a safe route when the canyon is closed

- ❖ A PLT member mentioned that someone at the public meeting requested that submitted comments be released, along with the names of commentors.
 - » KMOHR submitted a CORA request after the public meeting but before the comment period closed. They were sent all of the comment sheets from the public meeting as well as any comments that had been submitted through email, letter, and the project web page up to that date. However, CDOT will not share personal identifying contact information without permission, so that information was redacted from the comments before they were shared.
- ❖ A summary of all public comments received surrounding the first public engagement point is being prepared and will be shared with this group. Personal identifying information has been removed so the document can be posted to the project web page.
- ❖ Jacob noted that KMOHR had been having regular meetings with CDOT. Once the public meetings and property owner/residential ITF meetings started, KMOHR are now being informed and included through those other meetings, consistent with other property owners/residents/advocacy group stakeholders, per the PLT-endorsed process. KMOHR has requested additional meetings between CDOT and just their group continue.
 - » PLT-TT members agreed the previously established process of engagement through the property owner/residential ITF and general public meetings is appropriate and additional meetings should not be held.
- ◆ Issue Task Force Meetings
 - ❖ Property owner/residential meeting #1 held August 15
 - » The meeting format was a combination of presentation with interactive polling questions and approximately 30 minutes at the end for group discussion. Information presented was similar to what was presented at public meetings.
 - » This ITF is open to and includes residents and property owners along Cottonwood Pass, but also along other roadways such as CR 113.
 - » Mentimeter was used to gather real-time comments about Core Values and each site. Some side topics were mentioned, such as concern about traffic on CR 113. Many comments were received about concerns for additional traffic in the area if improvements are made.
 - » Participants ranked Respecting Corridor Character as the most important Core Value, with Natural Resource Preservation, Something Else, and Safety also receiving a fair amount of votes.
 - » A PLT member asked how the public input is weighted/considered.
 - CDOT aims for a holistic view. In recognition that these are county roads serving the public, input is sought from users of the roadway as well as those who live along the roadway. CDOT does not prioritize one stakeholder group, but strives to balance the needs.
 - CDOT will provide the comments received from public engagement points and the ITFs to the counties and PLT-TT. How the counties choose to use the information in the future for project decision-making will be up to them.
 - ❖ Natural resources meeting #1 – September 12
 - » Proposed members include: BLM, USFS, CPW, USFWS, USACE, CDOT environmental staff, and the Eagle County open space director. This group is limited to regulatory agency staff to discuss

existing conditions and gather input about next steps that will be required for permitting as improvement projects potentially move forward in the future.

- » The project includes only a high-level environmental overview to identify constraints and needs for future project scoping. Intensive field surveys and permitting are not included in this project. This is not as robust of an environmental process as a NEPA project.
- » Property owner/residential ITF members suggested Wilderness Workshop and Audubon as members. PLT members were asked if these groups should be invited to the ITF or participate through the general public engagement. They agreed advocacy groups should not be included in the ITF and the currently proposed members seem appropriate. The project team may gather data and information from the advocacy groups for consideration with the project overview.

- ◆ Adjacent property owner input

- ◇ Additional input from adjacent property owners was added to the project scope following public comments received at the property owner/residential ITF and discussions with county staff.
- ◇ Once potential improvement concepts are illustrated on public-friendly graphics on an aerial, they will be reviewed by CDOT and the counties. Then individualized outreach will occur to adjacent property owners at each site to gather their feedback on the concepts before they are shared at the next property owner/residential ITF.
- ◇ This effort will begin at the end of September when the first concepts are ready for release and continue for a few weeks. Adding time for this new task in the schedule pushed the next property owner/residential ITF meeting to end of October or early November and the next public meetings to mid-January to avoid the busy holiday season.
- ◇ The PLT agreed with this approach.

2. Status of Existing Conditions

- ◆ Existing right-of-way mapping – complete
- ◆ Survey – field work complete
 - ◇ Design at individual sites will proceed as survey data is processed. To allow for the project to move forward at the planned pace, engineers will not wait to begin design until all survey data is processed. Design will not move along the corridor in sequential order, but some fairly uncomplicated sites will be done first.
 - ◇ This group will likely receive concepts for review a few at a time as the survey comes in and design concepts are illustrated.
- ◆ Geotechnical – desktop study complete, field verification is expected to be complete by end of this week
 - ◇ Engineers will be looking at landslides, collapsible soils, dissolving soils, avalanche areas, debris flows, and rock falls in the field. Their findings related to the sites will be documented in the overall project report.
- ◆ Traffic and safety
 - ◇ Traffic and safety data will provide context for the potential improvement concepts.
- ◆ Environmental
 - ◇ Environmental work is focused on cultural, historic, wetlands, and wildlife. Evaluation is being conducted through desktop surveys with a brief field visit to drive the corridor.

- ✧ There are no previously documented Native American sites in this area.
- ✧ The biological evaluation started with pulling lists of known species in the area. The natural resources ITF will provide additional input about known species and type of habitat. CPW identified high priority areas for wildlife. The Peterson family had completed an inventory of known species on their ranch and provided that information to the project team.
- ✧ The national wetland inventory map was pulled and field-checked. Impaired water lists were also pulled.
- ✧ This information can help inform decisions for the counties moving forward, including next steps and permitting for future project scoping.
- ◆ Separate reports for each discipline are not planned. All findings will be documented in the project concept design report. General findings will be presented at the PLT-TT and ITF meetings.

3. Next Steps

- ◆ Natural resources ITF meeting #1 – September 12
- ◆ County check-in meetings (monthly)
- ◆ Adjacent property owner input – early/mid-October
- ◆ Property owner/residential ITF meeting #2 – late-October or early November, depending on adjacent property owner outreach timing
- ◆ PLT-TT meeting #3 – mid-November
- ◆ Emergency service provider meeting – planned to be held sometime during the design concept phase