

# I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

## MITIGATION TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

▶ **Meeting Date:** *Wednesday, Nov. 6, 2013* ▶ **Time:** *1:00 –3:00 pm*

▶ **Meeting Place:** *Homestead Conference Room, CDOT – Golden, Colorado*

▶ **Distribution / Attendees ( ' ):**

▶ <i>Paul Nikolai</i> <i>Parsons</i>	▶ <i>Wendy Wallach</i> <i>Parsons</i>	▶ <i>David Singer</i> <i>CDOT R1</i>
▶ <i>Carol Kruse</i> <i>USFS</i>	▶ <i>Scott Burton</i> <i>Jefferson County</i>	▶ <i>Larry Sly</i> <i>Envir. Mngr</i>
<i>Jo Ann Sorenson</i> <i>Clear Creek Cty</i>	<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Wilson</i>

Technical Issue/Challenge	Solution	Client Benefits
1.		
2.		

### Meeting Notes

#### New Business

**Topic #1 – Team Introductions**

- We went around the room and introduced ourselves, who we represented and quick history working on this corridor or for respective agency. Paul will send out a list of team members currently identified to everyone so that if someone is missing there is a chance to contact them.
- Scott thought that he would be the only representative from JeffCo while Carol thought there could be multiple people from the Forest Service that could participate but she would coordinate that effort.

**Topic #2 and #3 – Alternatives Presentation**

A: Paul (Parsons) used Ben and Ralph’s presentation to the I-70 Coalition Meeting to give team members an overview of the T&R Study process. If any questions came up that Paul or Wendy could not answer these could be forwarded to Paul and he would pass them on to be answered by other T&R team members.

- Jo Ann stated for the record that they don’t feel the Managed Lanes Alternatives complies to the ROD. Carol asked what happens then if the Managed Lanes Alternative does not comply with the ROD. David explained there are lots of ways it could go and this will be worked out with FHWA. He explained that doing this study came down to evaluating the risk of the managed lanes not meeting the ROD and CDOT felt that was a risk worth taking.
- Paul pointed out that the task of this group was to begin costing mitigation line items and identify what is required versus what is desired. Mitigation and Enhancements should be identified with Enhancements being prioritized.
- Larry pointed out that the unsolicited proposal by Parsons created extra revenue so if that’s accurate, we may be able to do some enhancements.

# I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

## Meeting Notes

- Wendy added that the charge of this group was to help identify enhancements and obtain corridor wide agreement on where we get the most bang for our buck.

### Topic #3 – Corridor Opportunities

- A: A discussion occurred about what is the bare minimum mitigation and is there enough money in budget for more than the minimum. Carol said we should not be costing out standard mitigation but should cost out mitigation that complies with the CSS document.
- B: The mitigation table from the ROD was handed out to be looked at by all members of the team. Paul pointed out how many of the requirements really pertained to SWEEP and ALIVE task forces. Those task forces would work with this group to develop mitigation on their own and funnel it through this team for concurrence.
- C: David also pointed out that there is overlap with the Permitting ITF because we are also looking at time and money associated with obtaining permits. Cost could be calculated but was not the real issue. The real issue with permitting was the potential timeline to get permits and the costs associated with potential delays. Carol have an example: if a Special Use Permit is needed from the USFS, it may take two years to obtain it. The cost is minimal but the time delay could cost millions. David commented that he understood that issue and it was a great point but our costs would be at a very high level and not to get too far into the weeds.
- D: Larry asked for the need to price in potential legal fees and if we should include them in Mitigation costs. No one had a good answer to that question but Paul would run it past the management tea.
- E: Larry asked how the other ITF's information for mitigation was being included. Paul explained other disciplines with mitigation will be working with this team as there is significant overlap with other ITS's – specifically the SWEEP and ALIVE groups.
- C: Aesthetic Costs
- I: Paul will handle costing out the landscape costs. Paul explained that standard costs for landscape and other items would be evaluated based on this project's requirements, not standard CDOT pricing and conservative numbers would be used at this high level estimate stage. He will be the point person to ensure aesthetics are adequately accounted for in the engineer's costs for bridges, walls, sound walls and other items and standard CDOT pricing is only one source of the price determination.
- D: Prioritization of Enhancements: Paul asked everyone to get a list of Enhancements they would like to see incorporated into the project if possible. He would compile this list by jurisdiction such as USFS, Clear Creek County and Idaho Springs. This list would then be reviewed by the team.
1. David explained how the Enhancements were handled on the US 36 project. Everyone thought the approach David explained made sense.

### Topic #4 – Existing Project Cost

- A: Paul urged the team to look for examples of costs of current or recent projects including Operations and Maintenance costs. This list could include lighting elements, trailhead development or other project work which could come to play in this corridor.

### Topic #5 –Next Steps

- A: The team decided on the next meeting time to be December 9<sup>th</sup> from 9 AM – 11 AM via WebX / Conference Call. Paul will set that up.

### Action Item Register – See Below.

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: Pau Nikolai - Parsons

Date: 11-20-13

Next Meeting: December 9<sup>th</sup>, 2013 – Web X

