



MEETING SUMMARY

Westbound I-70 Mountain Corridor - Concept Development Process

Project Leadership Team (PLT) Meeting

Monday, December 12, 2016

9:00 am – 12:00 pm

CDOT Offices, Golden, CO

Agenda

Time	Agenda Topic
9:00 am – 9:15 am	Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review
9:15 am – 9:45 am	<p>Review and Discussion: PLT Membership Overview and Role</p> <p>Objective: Confirm Project Leadership Team (PLT) membership and clarify role, e.g. endorse process, review TT’s work to ensure context is considered and break deadlocks.</p>
9:45 am – 10:15 am	<p>Discussion and Agreement: Confirm the mission and deliverable/outcome for the Concept Development Process</p> <p>Objective: PLT agreement on the overall mission and deliverable for the concept development process</p> <p><i>Example: “An outcome of the process is to identify concepts for the roadway and its context to be advanced into NEPA. The process will also identify any fatal flaws with concepts.”</i></p>
10:15 am – 10:25 am	Break
10:25 am – 11:00 am	<p>Recommendations: Technical Team (TT) membership and roles</p> <p>Objective: Identify TT members to serve on the project and clarify their role. Also discuss other groups (such as a larger stakeholder group.)</p>
11:00am – 11:30 am	<p>Review and Discuss: Review corridor segments and context maps</p> <p>Objective: Agreement on approach to corridor segments including from Empire Junction to EJMT (“Segment D”)</p>

11:30 am – 11:50 am	<p>Discussion: How does high speed transit fit in to this project?</p> <p>Objective: Determine the approach to high speed transit in the Concept Development Process.</p>
11:50 am – 12:00 pm	<p>Overview: PLT Charter and Next Steps</p> <p>Objective: Provide an overview of Draft PLT Charter and discuss next steps.</p>

Meeting Summary

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review

Jonathan Bartsch, CDR Associates, welcomed the PLT members and facilitated introductions. Jonathan outlined the agenda and asked for feedback. The PLT agreed to the agenda with no changes.

PLT Membership Overview and Role

Jonathan reviewed the PLT membership and roles and asked for feedback and suggestions.

PLT Membership

PLT membership includes affected local jurisdictions and agencies, CDOT and FHWA.

In the ROD, the guidelines for PLT formation suggest the following seats on the PLT:

- FHWA (1-2)
- CDOT program engineer (1)
- CDOT project manager (1)
- Community leaders (1-2)
- CDOT environmental lead (1)
- Open Seat based on project needs (1)
- Contractors and consultants – as needed

Jonathan asked: Are there people missing? Are there people who should not be here?

The group discussed Eagle County and Summit County as members of the PLT because these counties will be extremely impacted by this project.

- It was noted that it is important to try and “tighten the PLT up” and it may make more sense for Eagle and Summit counties to be on the TT because they have technical experience and would then be in the front seat driving designs. The ROD calls for PLT members from the area where the project is taking place -- and this does not include Eagle or Summit. Gina read information from Appendix A of the FEIS that states the affected communities are those who will need to take some action relative to the improvements being considered. This could include 1041 approvals.

- There was additional discussion on the specific areas outside of where the project is taking place – what is the role of impacted counties where there isn't actual construction?
 - These counties are still impacted by road closures and traffic congestion.

Decision on PLT Membership:

The PLT agrees that Summit and Eagle County will both be asked to sit on the PLT. The Project Management Team has already spoken with other impacted counties, i.e. Jefferson and Gilpin, and these counties would like to remain on the Technical Team, not the PLT.

PLT Role

- Facilitate formal actions by councils, boards and commissions to keep the project moving forward.
- Lead and endorse the concept development process including the Context Statement, Critical Success Factors, Project Structure, PLT/TT Roles and Responsibilities and Evaluation Criteria.
- Select Technical Team Members
- Identify disciplines and stakeholders that need to be involved
- Ensure the Context Sensitive Solution (CSS) process is being followed faithfully. The CSS process focuses on context.
- Get the TT “unstuck” if there is a roadblock
- Ensure that the TT is set up for success

The PLT does not object to this role.

Draft Mission and deliverable/outcome for the Concept Development Process

The Mission of the Concept Development Process is:

- **To identify concepts that can be carried forward because they do not have red flags or fatal flaws.**
- **To develop and recommend feasible concepts for the WB I-70 Mountain Corridor for further evaluation.**
- **To consider overall context, including physical, historic and legal context (e.g. ROD and MOU).**

The geographic limits of the project are the top of Floyd Hill to the EJMT (4 anticipated segments).

Question: What are considered 30,000 foot “concepts” versus alternatives that a NEPA process would be looking at?

Answer: For example, the “vision” is to develop road improvements from top of Floyd Hill to EJMT. For some segments, this could include a WB PPSL. We want to go through these visions and define palatable alternatives to advance to NEPA while considering context.

Examples of this could be consideration of concepts such as tunneling or interchange reconfigurations. We will attempt to determine what is likely infeasible before we get into the NEPA process but may not be able to do so, in which case that will be fleshed out in the NEPA process.

Questions: Does a “concept” include “what are the appropriate segments?”

Answer: No. That is not a concept. The concepts relate to the ROD-specific improvements. For example – if we were looking at 3 WB lanes, we will want to tease out the following “concepts” - how would the 3 WB lanes be configured? Other “concepts would include: should we get rid of interchanges or transform interchanges? How does a bridge at Floyd hill get built? This is a conceptual design and we are designing what will most likely be constructed. This could get very technical (which is why we will have the TT and ITF) – at least in first 3 segments.

We are not working on a detailed alternative, but the concepts need to have enough specificity to know if they are feasible and could advance to NEPA. The TT will define what the appropriate balance of specificity is and how detailed is the concept needs to be.

Question: How does this effort connect with MOU, ROD and conceptual design? Does the result of NEPA become part of ROD

Answer: Yes, absolutely – the current ROD is Tier 1, but a new NEPA process gets initiated in Tier 2. The existing ROD and MOU define what we are going to do in “English” now we are designing with a magic marker, lines are thicker, i.e. where does the road go over/through the river. Then, we go to NEPA and use a ball point pen and eraser to get really specific.

Based on CSS process, there will be a new CSS process initiate for NEPA. But now, we are working on the process piece to ensure we are taking context into consideration moving forward.

The Outcome of the Concept Development Process

The PLT Confirmed the Following Outcome:

“The outcome of the process is to identify concepts for the roadway to be advanced into NEPA, taking into consideration the context of the communities and landscapes through which it travels. The process will also identify any fatal flaws with concepts.”

Technical Team (TT) membership and roles

The TT membership and roles includes:

- Jurisdictional staff and other stakeholders with technical expertise.
- Provides technical advice to develop concepts.
- Evaluates concepts using Core Values and Evaluation Criteria developed by PLT.
- Defines the level of ‘feasibility’ for each segment.

- Anticipated number of TT members – 20.

Question: What is the difference between ITF and TT?

Answer: The TT determines if we need ITF to look at specific issues, e.g. linkage interference zones. ITFs are as needed.

Question: Are the Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) TT members or just participants?

Answer: There are 4 consultant teams and 3 contractor teams. The idea is for them to provide design and constructability input for consideration by the TT. There is a lot of horsepower from ideas that come out of the TT and the SME are charged with seeing if TT guidance is feasible. The SMEs participate on TTs and ITF as needed. If there is a fatal flaw technically, no reason to advance to NEPA.

Jonathan passes around the suggested TT list and asks the group if there are people who are missing. We want to keep the group size reasonable and also be inclusive to ensure context is included.

Suggestions:

The PLT deliberated and added the following members

Paul Winkle – CPW Aquatic Biologist

Margaret Grabill – The Georgetown Loop RR

Steve Cook - DRCOG

John Muscatell – Clear Creek County

Andy Marsh – Idaho Springs

Tom Gosioroski – Summit County

Brendan McGuire – Vail Ski Resorts

Steve Hurlbert – Winter Park Ski Resort

Rob Goodell – Loveland Ski Resort

The PLT removed John Cantemessa and Steve Turner from the TT as redundant.

Question: Do historical and legal concepts include 106 and 1041 review, etc? The historic issues in the Georgetown area are a big consideration.

Answer: Impacts to these resources will definitely be considered from a high level but will be evaluated in more detail during the future NEPA phase. During this project lifecycle phase we are just identifying red flags. During the NEPA process these will go through the full eligibility and effects Section 106 clearance piece. This deliverable does not go through the 1041 permitting process at this point.

Question: How will the I-70 coalition remain informed?

Answer: The I-70 PLT designee will go back to the I-70 Coalition board and decide whether all members are represented and give PLT/TT updated to board and members. .

Question: The TT is only supposed to be 20 people, and it's bigger. Does this matter?

Answer: Not everyone will show up to the TT meetings. The team will self-select and we will call some of these TT members if we really need their input for a particular agenda item. We will make sure that our agendas list key topic areas so TT members who are specialists in these areas show up to these TT meetings. This has proven to work on past projects on the Corridor where a core of TT members are always present so the group is a manageable size while still getting the expertise needed in the room.

Question: How does the group maintain continuity? We do not want to spend a lot of time catching people up.

Answer: Consistency is achieved from self-selection. PLT is in charge of process. Part of the process is that PLT members make sure that TT is set up for success and TT members can and do attend meetings.

TT Membership Proposal and Decision

Proposal:

There is one Technical Team

The Goal is to have continuity. This continuity will be achieved by TT members self-selecting. The PLT members are responsible for making sure TT members get to the table and show up.

A TT agenda will be put out in advance to identify issue topics for specific areas and ensure that appropriate TT members are present.

If need be, the TT will go to ITFs and groups for specific issue areas

The TT is meant to ID constraints not meant to design (this is why the SMEs are part of the process).

Jonathan asked the group if there was support for the role, mission and who is in membership of the TT. There were no objections from the PLT.

Review of corridor segments and context maps

There are 4 segments. The TT would likely start with Segment 1.

The group was encouraged to look at the context maps developed during the CSS process brought in by Kevin Shanks, THK, to get a feel for how context will be mapped and included. New maps are also being prepared which show new information developed during the various

Tier 2 processes (Twin Tunnels, Westbound TT, PPSL, 55/65 study, etc. These maps will be available at the first TT meeting.

TT and SMES will need to understand context – the series of maps brought in by THK were developed when I70 Mountain Corridor CSS process was developed. These maps are 5-6 years old and serve as a starting place. HDR will bring the new maps to the first TT meeting.

Question: Segment D – why is this one segment?

Answer: Because there is no vision yet. Deliverable is more conceptual than segments 1-3. We are restrained by the ROD to only operational improvements from Georgetown to Silver Plume and Silver Plume to Bakerville, except for the Other Highway Improvements listed in the ROD. Segment D will be a different product. Segment D is varied in its solutions and local government interests compared to 1-3.

Question: If we segment D further, would this be a PLT decision?

Answer: Yes

High Speed Transit

Automated Guideway System is in the ROD. A brief overview below:

- Advanced Guideway System (AGS) Feasibility Study completed in August 2014.
- Identified technology that can work in the corridor -- magnetic levitation (maglev).
- Funding not currently identified.
- This Concept Development Process is focused on implementing solutions in next 3-5 years.
- Will not preclude high speed transit in the future.

Discussion

High-speed transit, such as AGS, are not limited by steep slopes, can go up to 250mph, etc. Estimates in the CDOT AGS Feasibility Study found AGS to be economically sound if built from DIA to Eagle airport (2-hr trip, with 3 or 4 stops in between).

USFS advocated for Aztec Engineering, specialists in designing and constructing high-speed transit systems (in Europe and Asia), to be on the TT. Mike Riggs, is the Vice President of Aztec and led CDOT's AGS study. Other suggestions for the TT include representatives of HDR who also worked on the AGS study, David Krutsinger and the current consultants/contractors working on the SME.

The group agreed that there needs to be a second opinion, outside of CDOT, looking at the AGS and there is a conflict with having a CDOT employee be an AGS SME. It is important that when roads are restructured in Glenwood Canyon that the process takes into account where the AGS is going to fit. It is important not to preclude AGS. It is important that we do not jump the gun with highway projects and that we look at the range of AGS as we further go into concepts. The

concept development process must treat AGS as the preferred alternative as indicated by the ROD.

It was suggested that the current project SMEs and HDR have resources to evaluate any specific highway improvement concepts with respect to not preclude AGS in the future. The group agreed that this would be acceptable as a starting point moving forward.

PLT Charter:

Jonathan will send around PLT charter electronically looking for edits and feedback to formalize what we have been talking about in addition to meeting notes.

Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Discussion

It is important to identify a stakeholder engagement plan. How are we going to engage the public and inform the public and other stakeholders? We need to develop a feedback loop.

Suggestions

- Notifying and engaging the public
- Public meetings along the way in some type of tightly controlled environment
- Open House
- A facilitated meeting?
- These discussions need to engage a wide variety of people. This will help identify who we need to check in with re: stakeholders.

- WHEN?
 - **Now**
 - Go to the public first, with a blank slate, open it up and let people say “don’t screw up construction” – or your context statement and vision are off.
 - We need 3 solid public engagement periods for people to come out and plug in before we get too far down the road. Need to make sure people are aware. Show the data from the Mountain Express Lane and how well it is working EB. Acknowledge there was a rough go during construction. But, now, working well.
 - We need to be proactive. Get information before we launch.
 - We can present on the ROD, MOU and EB PPSL, IGAs, Twin Tunnels
 - Good idea to let people know that this effort is underway and is a multi-agency effort, not just CDOT.
 - **Wait**

- One disadvantage to going to the public now is that we have a lot of process but no concepts.
 - An open house would work once there are some concrete alternatives identified and pictures and then invite the public to put sticky notes on what they want in certain spots. Document comments and get feedback.
 - We need some alternatives identified before going to the public.
- The PLT will need to take an active role – there must be collaboration on the public outreach effort.

PLT Decision:

The PLT supported a public meeting and agreed to participate at the meeting and help with public outreach. About 3-4 meetings. 1 early on, 2 check ins, and 1 where we show product.

Theme of first public meeting: Lessons learned (positive and negative).

Next Steps

Action items

- **PMT:** Will start conceptualizing public meeting 1) Time 2) focus 3) format (Idaho Springs, Georgetown, USFS, I-70, CCC). In the next couple weeks or first of the year.
- **PMT:** Will invite an Eagle County representative to join the PLT.
- **CDR:** Send out PLT Charter for electronic review and feedback. Send out Meeting Summary and Updated PLT/TT notes. Set up next TT meeting based on TT members confirmed at 12.12 PLT meeting.
- **PLT:** Next PLT Meeting Date: After the TT meetings
- **PLT:** Begin to think about support role and outreach for public meetings. Review Charter and provide feedback.
- **Next TT Meeting:** January 4th, 9am to noon.

Meeting Attendees

PLT Members: Stephen Harelson, Kelly Larson, Scott Vargo, Carol Kruse, Adam Bianchi, Mike Hillman, Thomas Hale, Neil Ogden, Margaret Bowes, Tim Mauk

Project Management Team: Kevin Shanks, Steve Long, Gina McAfee, Jonathan Bartsch, Taber Ward, Benjamin Acimovic, Joe Mahoney, Lizzie Kemp

Members of the Public: JoAnn Sorensen