

**I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY
ISSUES TASK FORCES**

ALTERNATIVES TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES
--

- ▶ **Meeting Date:** *Wednesday, Oct. 10, 2013* ▶ **Time:** *3:00 –4:30 pm*
▶ **Meeting Place:** *Summit County Library Conference Room, Silverthorne Colorado*

Al Racciatti	Louis Berger	Vanessa Henderson	CDOT	Margaret Bowes	I-70 Coalition
Jim Bemelen	CDOT	David Krutsinger	CDOT-Transit	Tim Mauck	Clear Creek County
Bob Tschupp	Colorado Mountain Resorts	Paul Nikolai	Parsons	Ben Acimovic	CDOT
Brendan McGuire	Vail Resorts	Ralph Trapani	Parsons	Wendy Wallach	Parsons
Mary Jane Loevlie	I-70 Coalition Member				

Meeting Notes

New Business

Topic #1 – Team Introductions

- As many of the members from Kick-off meeting #1 could not make this meeting and several new people attended, introductions were done.

Topic #2 – Alternatives Presentation

A: Ben Acimovic (CDOT) and Ralph Trapani (Parsons)

- As part of the I-70 Coalition meeting, Ben and Ralph provided the Coalition a Powerpoint which summarized the T&R Study, including project alternatives. Ben summarized the I-70 Mountain Corridor project history, including the PEIS and ROD and explained how the Parsons unsolicited proposal led to where we are today. Ben explained the process and how there are three consultants under separate contracts with CDOT and how each provides a level of checks and balances in the evaluation process
- Ralph summarized the original Parsons unsolicited proposal option to explain how traffic could work with a reversible lane concept. Part of this presentation was the video simulation through a section of the corridor showing traffic weaves and direct connections at specific interchanges. It was pointed out that neither the 2 or 3 lane reversible alternative eliminates the potential for the recommended Advanced Guideway System (AGS) system to be built at a later date when funding may become available.
- This presentation generated questions from the Coalition and the ITF team members, these are not documented within these summary form of minutes.

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

Meeting Notes

Topic #3 – Current List of Alternatives

A: The team went through the current list of the following alternative options for evaluation.

1. 55 mph PEIS Minimum Program/PEIS Maximum Program with/without third bore at the Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels
2. 65 mph PEIS Minimum Program/PEIS Maximum Program with/without third bore at the Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels
3. Reversible express lanes (2 lanes)
 - 3a. express lanes at 65 mph
 - 3b. 55 mph for General Purpose Lanes
 - 3c. 65 mph for General Purpose lanes
4. Reversible express lanes (3 lanes)
 - 4a. express lanes at 65 mph
 - 4b. 55 mph for General Purpose Lanes
 - 4c. 65 mph for General Purpose Lanes

- 1: Min / Max alternatives (65 and 55) are being developed per the PEIS with AGS incorporated. Information from the current AGS evaluation is being incorporated but does not include feeder systems at Idaho Springs and Breckenridge. Those are being estimated by Parsons.
- 2: Express Lanes are being evaluated with 2 lane and 3 lane options as well as being done at 55 and 65 mph design speeds.
- 3: Ben (CDOT) stated that tolling all existing lanes will be evaluated as a baseline comparisons but not as a build option.
- 4: A question came up during the presentation given to the I-70 Coalition about the current concept under investigation for a Peak Period Shoulder Lane (PPSL) option. This discussion carried over to this Alternatives Task Force meeting. Jim Bemelen (CDOT) stated that FHWA has made it clear that having the PPSL alternative as a 50 year permanent solution would not be acceptable. Tim Mauck from Clear Creek County wanted to know why that was and what defined permanent and temporary – where that threshold was. They pointed out that a similar project was done and approved by the FHWA in Minnesota. Jim said that different FHWA divisions will allow different projects but restated that the Colorado Division office of FHWA has been very clear that the current proposal to open and toll shoulders on weekends would not be allowed as a long term solution. The template being proposed as is would have to substantially widen, therefore making a long-term option a larger impact than currently being discussed. Jim Bemelen will coordinate with FHWA and Clear Creek County to resolve this issue.

Mary Jane Loevlie (Clear Creek County) pointed out that Idaho Springs is in the narrowest part of the corridor and would be most impacted by any wider alternatives being proposed.

Topic #4 – New Alternative Process

A: Submittal Process: The Task Force discussed the process for generating additional options for evaluation, as it needs to be wrapped up quickly to stay on schedule. The discussion focused on if we solicit requests for new alternatives and whom do we ask. It was decided that individual members of the Alternatives Task Force and PLT could request alternatives from stakeholders but a general request to the public was not warranted. Each new option being suggested will need to be preliminarily vetted and evaluated and perhaps eliminated by the Alternatives Task Force based on engineering judgment and experience.

B: Evaluation Process: It was suggested and approved by the Task Force that new alternative options should be evaluated by the Task Force with a recommendation to the PLT. The PLT would then also be allowed to evaluate a new alternative option and recommend it move forward or be eliminated. This process needs to be documented and formalized prior to the evaluation process occurring. Jim (CDOT) said he did not want new options to be evaluated at both the 55 and 65 speeds as it could lead to having too many alternative options to analyze.

C: Deadline: In order to stay on the proposed project schedule, any new alternative options need to be identified quickly. The group agreed that the December 5th Project Leadership Team meeting would be a good deadline to

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

Meeting Notes

finalize alternative options in concert with the PLT. The Task Force agreed that any new proposed alternative options would need to be defined for evaluation and distributed to the Task Force approximately one week before the next meeting, November 21st. Any new proposed alternative options should be provided to Ben (CDOT) and/or Wendy (Parsons) prior to distribution to the Task Force on November 13th. Each Task Force member is expected to review any newly proposed alternative option and be prepared to discuss the options at the next Task Force meeting on November 21st.

Topic #5 – Review of Colorado State Statutes and FHWA regulations.

A: The state statutes regarding tolling existing capacity were provided by CDOT and read to the Task Force. It states that any tolling of existing facilities must be approved by all entities that could be affected. This discussion focused on how almost any entity, even out of state influences, could be considered 'affected by tolling existing facilities.

Jim Bemelen (CDOT) restated that the current governor would not allow tolling of existing facilities.

Topic #6 – Alternative Schematics

A: Ben (CDOT) went through what alternatives we were going to have as design concepts for the PLT review. He mentioned that the 2 and 3 lane reversible options are being worked on by Parsons now. These are being prepared for a November 5th submittal to the Counties for review. Part of this evaluation will provide areas where the I-70 Mountain CSS guidelines work and where they will not be applied. There will be a 2 week review of this design submittal and an additional follow-up meeting with Clear Creek County and others to review their comments.

Topic #7 – AGS Study Update

A: David Krutsinger (CDOT) provided an update of the parallel study being conducted by CDOT for the proposed AGS system recommended in the Record of Decision. He said 3 issues are being evaluated: Technology; Alignments; and Financial Considerations.

1. Technology is available for the AGS. It has come down to MagLev or high speed rail.
2. Alignment: 4 alignments were considered. The alignment running along the corridor would not work because it does not allow high enough speeds. Speeds of between 120 mph and 150 mph maximized the ridership and fare box recovery levels.
3. Financial: No funding is available for at least the next 5 years.
4. Two major data collection efforts have been completed as part of the study. An origin and destination study for approximately a 150 mile distance as well as a stated preference survey getting data on acceptable prices and modes of transit.

Topic #8 – Project Termini

A: Tim Mauck (Clear Creek County) was wondering why the T & R Study was not going to the termini defined within the PEIS and why the study was limiting the project termini from Golden to Silverthorne. Jim Bemelen said the unsolicited proposal is phased and the first phase ends at Silverthorne. CDOT wants the study to make "an apples to apples" comparison, so Silverthorne is the project limit. He added that had the unsolicited proposal not occurred, the T & R study would not be happening and these limits were agreed to and approved by the PLT.

B: Ralph (Parsons) mentioned that the unsolicited proposal also had a Phase 2 that extended the project past Vail and additional studies could be conducted to study those limits later. Dick Bauman (CDOT) said that extending the study limits was a very viable option and that the unsolicited proposal documented that Phase 1 did provide an additional surplus of money and that money could be used to fund a 2nd phase at a later date. He added if a viable solution is not found, studying this corridor could continue and nothing would ever get built while the problem only continues to grow.

Action Item Register – See Below.

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

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:* Paul Nikolai - Parsons *Date:* 10-15-13

Next Meeting: 9:30 am & November 21th, 2013 Corporate Circle, Homestead Room.



